

Also, letter of Justin M. Cooper, to accompany House bill 1068, for his relief—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of Lead City Miners' Union, of Lead, S. Dak., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAYNARD: Petition of the Iroquois Club, of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the construction of war vessels in the United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Virginia State Good Roads Convention, Richmond, Va., in favor of liberal appropriations for the Good Roads Bureau—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of Massachusetts State Board of Trade, favoring the appointment of a commission to study and report upon the industrial and commercial conditions in China—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. McCLEARY: Resolutions of Minnesota State Encampment, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring a more liberal interpretation of the pension laws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of Olmsted (Minn.) Good Roads Association, in favor of liberal appropriations for the Good Roads Bureau—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of the St. Paul (Minn.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring liberal appropriations for the Department of Agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOON: Papers to accompany House bill 11449, granting an increase of pension to Otto Holtnorth—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: Petitions of Branches Polish National Alliance at Nanticoke and Glenlyon, Pa., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. Powers of Maine: Papers to accompany House bill relating to the correction of the military record of Edwin C. Winchester, alias Willis E. Jackson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 13189, for the relief of Henry R. Cowan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER: Protest of merchants of Meadville, Mo., against House bill 6578, known as the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RYAN: Resolutions of a mass meeting of the Utah volunteers, favoring bill to allow travel pay from Manila, P. I., to San Francisco to those who enlisted on call for volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHATTUC: Papers to accompany bill to restore David B. Jeffers to the Army of the United States and place him on the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: Resolutions of Michigan State Grange against the ship subsidy bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNOOK: Papers to accompany House bill 13192, granting a pension to Lionel O. Coleman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 13194, granting a pension to Lewis F. Ross—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill 13193, granting an increase of pension to George N. Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of Piano and Organ Workers' Union of Derby, Conn., to exclude Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: Resolutions of Safety Lodge, No. 142, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, for the passage of House bill 9330, for a further restriction of Chinese immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Safety Lodge, No. 142, Locomotive Firemen; Division No. 26, Order of Railway Conductors; Machinists' Lodge No. 105; Journeymen Tailors' Union, all of Toledo, Ohio, and Retail Clerks' Union No. 239, of Bowling Green, Ohio, favoring more restrictive immigration laws—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WANGER: Petitions of Branch No. 543, Pottstown, Pa., Polish National Alliance, favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolutions of Hagerstown (Pa.) Circle, No. 37, Brotherhood of the Union, in favor of a national park at Valley Forge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOODS: Petition of the State Council of California, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restrictive immigration laws—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Order of Railroad Conductors No. 195, Sacramento, Cal., favoring a further restriction of Chinese immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE.

MONDAY, March 31, 1902.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last, when, on request of Mr. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal, without objection, will stand approved.

## PACIFIC RAILROADS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 18th instant, a statement of the traffic relations between the railroads that connect the waters of the Pacific Ocean and the Government of the United States, with a reference to the statutes upon which such relations have been conducted, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Pacific Railroads, and ordered to be printed.

## LOTS IN THE CITY OF WASHINGTON.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in relation to Senate bill 4496, to confirm title to lots 3, 4, and 5, in square 979, in Washington, D. C., and also a copy of a letter from Col. Theodore A. Bingham, the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds in the city of Washington, relative to a bill of the House of Representatives on the same subject; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills:

A bill (H. R. 2273) granting a pension to Martha A. DeLamarter;

A bill (H. R. 10486) granting a pension to Alida Payne;

A bill (H. R. 11418) granting an increase of pension to Hannah T. Knowles; and

A bill (H. R. 12315) granting an increase of pension to James Todd.

The message also announced that the House had passed with amendments the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (S. 1172) granting an increase of pension to Catharine F. Edmunds;

A bill (S. 2371) granting a pension to Andrew J. Felt;

A bill (S. 2976) granting an increase of pension to Edward Thompson;

A bill (S. 3743) granting an increase of pension to Frances Gurlley Elderkin; and

A bill (S. 4071) granting an increase of pension to George C. Tillman.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 6) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Stone;

A bill (S. 13) granting an increase of pension to George Daniels;

A bill (S. 880) granting an increase of pension to Emory S. Foster;

A bill (S. 965) granting a pension to Eliza B. Gamble;

A bill (S. 1039) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel C. Goodwin;

A bill (S. 1095) granting an increase of pension to Mary Morgan;

A bill (S. 1264) granting an increase of pension to Torgus Haraldson;

A bill (S. 1289) granting an increase of pension to Julius W. Clark;

A bill (S. 1630) granting an increase of pension to Ella R. Graham;

A bill (S. 1681) granting an increase of pension to Maria Louisa Michie;

A bill (S. 1872) granting an increase of pension to Abbie George;

A bill (S. 1924) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Feneran;

A bill (S. 1942) granting an increase of pension to Kate H. Clements;

A bill (S. 1967) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Freeman;

A bill (S. 1979) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Howard;

A bill (S. 1982) granting an increase of pension to Eugene J. Oulman;

A bill (S. 2006) granting an increase of pension to James Le-hew;

A bill (S. 2046) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Sauls;

A bill (S. 2262) granting an increase of pension to George Farne;

A bill (S. 2287) granting an increase of pension to Georgie Josephine Walcott;

A bill (S. 2379) granting an increase of pension to George H. Evans;

A bill (S. 2398) granting an increase of pension to George W. Myers;

A bill (S. 2505) granting an increase of pension to John Barnard;

A bill (S. 2625) granting an increase of pension to Carlin Hamlin;

A bill (S. 2768) granting an increase of pension to John G. Hutchinson;

A bill (S. 2938) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Dunn;

A bill (S. 3072) granting a pension to Oliver Gisborne;

A bill (S. 3187) granting an increase of pension to Leroy S. Smith;

A bill (S. 3213) granting a pension to Anna J. Thomas;

A bill (S. 3216) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Taylor;

A bill (S. 3299) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah Tuf-ford;

A bill (S. 3481) granting an increase of pension to James E. Dexter;

A bill (S. 3514) granting an increase of pension to Leander Parmelee;

A bill (S. 3518) granting a pension to Nadine A. Turchin;

A bill (S. 3577) granting an increase of pension to Mary V. Walker;

A bill (S. 3650) granting a pension to Sarah A. Carter;

A bill (S. 3660) granting a pension to Mary Sweeney;

A bill (S. 3696) granting an increase of pension to Edward H. Armstrong;

A bill (S. 3910) granting an increase of pension to Robert S. Woodbury;

A bill (S. 4021) granting a pension to Sarah Frances Taft;

A bill (S. 4086) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Foster;

A bill (S. 4095) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Dudley;

A bill (S. 4214) granting an increase of pension to John Mc-Donald;

A bill (S. 4304) granting a pension to John S. Nelson;

A bill (S. 4346) granting a pension to Augusta Turner;

A bill (S. 4363) granting the Central Arizona Railway Company a right of way for railroad purposes through the San Francisco Mountains Forest Reserve;

A bill (S. 4413) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Greenleaf; and

A bill (S. 4486) granting an increase of pension to Myra W. Robinson.

The message also announced that the House had passed the fol-lowing bills and joint resolution; in which it requested the con-currence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 639) granting an increase of pension to Justus Canfield;

A bill (H. R. 954) granting an increase of pension to Rachel Brown;

A bill (H. R. 1012) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Moran;

A bill (H. R. 1046) granting an increase of pension to John J. Martin;

A bill (H. R. 1292) granting a pension to Joseph P. O'Brien;

A bill (H. R. 1422) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Merritt;

A bill (H. R. 1423) granting an increase of pension to Asa Tarbox;

A bill (H. R. 1453) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Kirwan;

A bill (H. R. 1455) granting an increase of pension to Aaron S. Gatliff;

A bill (H. R. 1486) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Perkins;

A bill (H. R. 1592) for the relief of F. M. Vowells;

A bill (H. R. 1685) granting an increase of pension to Augustus E. Hodges;

A bill (H. R. 1709) granting an increase of pension to Edwin J. Godfrey;

A bill (H. R. 1742) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Lewis;

A bill (H. R. 1811) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Milsted;

A bill (H. R. 2286) granting an increase of pension to Mary Etna Poole;

A bill (H. R. 2316) to correct the military record of Albert Boker;

A bill (H. R. 2599) granting an increase of pension to John Hall;

A bill (H. R. 2857) granting an increase of pension to Frances J. Haughton;

A bill (H. R. 2901) to remove the charge of desertion borne op-posite the name of Abram Williams;

A bill (H. R. 2994) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Noble;

A bill (H. R. 3292) granting an increase of pension to Arthur H. Perkins;

A bill (H. R. 3379) to correct the military record of Calvin A. Rice;

A bill (H. R. 3442) to correct the record of John O'Brien;

A bill (H. R. 3486) granting an increase of pension to James S. Peery;

A bill (H. R. 3519) granting an increase of pension to John Marble;

A bill (H. R. 3653) granting an increase of pension to James W. Poor;

A bill (H. R. 3733) granting an increase of pension to Israel Haller;

A bill (H. R. 3755) granting an increase of pension to Lawson Williams;

A bill (H. R. 3868) granting an increase of pension to Isadora F. Maxfield;

A bill (H. R. 3899) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Wilson;

A bill (H. R. 4103) granting a pension to William C. Hickox;

A bill (H. R. 4183) granting an increase of pension to Gottlieb Kafer;

A bill (H. R. 4184) granting an increase of pension to John Glenn;

A bill (H. R. 4238) granting a pension to Emsley Kinsauls;

A bill (H. R. 4261) granting an increase of pension to Sanders R. Seamonds;

A bill (H. R. 4426) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Sims;

A bill (H. R. 4542) granting a pension to Eliza J. West;

A bill (H. R. 4622) granting a pension to Frank W. Lynn;

A bill (H. R. 5111) granting an increase of pension to James G. Bowland;

A bill (H. R. 5150) granting a pension to Mary C. Trask;

A bill (H. R. 5170) granting an increase of pension to Freder-ick Wright;

A bill (H. R. 5328) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Bortle;

A bill (H. R. 5453) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Wilknison;

A bill (H. R. 5551) granting an increase of pension to Charles Edward Price Lance, alias Edward Price;

A bill (H. R. 5560) granting an increase of pension to Annie L. Evens;

A bill (H. R. 5600) granting an increase of pension to John G. Sanders;

A bill (H. R. 5695) granting an increase of pension to John M. Seydel;

A bill (H. R. 5711) granting an increase of pension to James R. Brockett;

A bill (H. R. 5870) granting an increase of pension to Oscar W. Lowery;

A bill (H. R. 5883) granting a pension to Martha A. Hollingsead;

A bill (H. R. 5961) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Coles;

A bill (H. R. 6021) granting a pension to William Kaste;

A bill (H. R. 6205) granting an increase of pension to Richmond M. Curtis;

A bill (H. R. 6412) granting a pension to Carl Jordan;

A bill (H. R. 6441) granting an increase of pension to William H. Wood;

A bill (H. R. 6645) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Austin;

A bill (H. R. 6686) granting an increase of pension to Elbridge Franklin;

A bill (H. R. 6699) granting a pension to Esther A. C. Hardee;

A bill (H. R. 6721) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Ray;

A bill (H. R. 6823) granting an increase of pension to Allen W. Merrill;

A bill (H. R. 6871) granting an increase of pension to Harman Scramlin;  
 A bill (H. R. 6890) granting an increase of pension to Robert G. Scroggs;  
 A bill (H. R. 7109) granting an increase of pension to Stanton L. Brabham;  
 A bill (H. R. 7116) granting an increase of pension to Alexander F. McConnell;  
 A bill (H. R. 7512) granting an increase of pension to Neil Gillespy;  
 A bill (H. R. 7560) granting an increase of pension to George W. Butler;  
 A bill (H. R. 7678) granting a pension to Mary Holmes;  
 A bill (H. R. 7766) granting an increase of pension to John Huffman;  
 A bill (H. R. 7982) granting an increase of pension to William T. Peterson;  
 A bill (H. R. 7986) granting a pension to Clara C. Hawks;  
 A bill (H. R. 7994) granting an increase of pension to Margaret M. Grant;  
 A bill (H. R. 8003) granting an increase of pension to Louisa M. Macfarlane;  
 A bill (H. R. 8009) granting a pension to Sarah B. Clingerman;  
 A bill (H. R. 8106) granting an increase of pension to Daniel J. Mahoney;  
 A bill (H. R. 8134) granting an increase of pension to James H. Dunn;  
 A bill (H. R. 8341) granting a pension to Hannah C. Chase;  
 A bill (H. R. 8355) granting a pension to Robert C. Ballard;  
 A bill (H. R. 8721) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Westbrook;  
 A bill (H. R. 8794) granting an increase of pension to Henry I. Smith;  
 A bill (H. R. 9018) granting a pension to Ida D. Greene;  
 A bill (H. R. 9037) to allow the commutation of homestead entries in certain cases;  
 A bill (H. R. 9140) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann E. Sperry;  
 A bill (H. R. 9187) granting an increase of pension to Caroline A. Hammond;  
 A bill (H. R. 9219) granting an increase of pension to Colmore L. Newman;  
 A bill (H. R. 9290) granting a pension to Frances L. Ackley;  
 A bill (H. R. 9308) granting an increase of pension to Edwin P. Johnson;  
 A bill (H. R. 9366) granting an increase of pension to Peter T. Norris;  
 A bill (H. R. 9370) granting an increase of pension to John J. Wolfe;  
 A bill (H. R. 9378) granting a pension to Clara B. Townsend;  
 A bill (H. R. 9415) granting an increase of pension to James Matthews;  
 A bill (H. R. 9458) granting an increase of pension to Adolph Becker;  
 A bill (H. R. 9592) granting a pension to Emily Briggs;  
 A bill (H. R. 9654) granting a pension to John S. James;  
 A bill (H. R. 9656) granting an increase of pension to Lunsford Y. Bailey;  
 A bill (H. R. 9658) granting an increase of pension to Robert Stewart;  
 A bill (H. R. 9717) granting a pension to Isaac M. Pangle;  
 A bill (H. R. 9777) granting a pension to Helen F. Lasher;  
 A bill (H. R. 9847) granting an increase of pension to Zachariah R. Saunders;  
 A bill (H. R. 9883) granting an increase of pension to William Kelley;  
 A bill (H. R. 9952) granting a pension to William P. Featherstone;  
 A bill (H. R. 10010) granting a pension to Mina Weirauch;  
 A bill (H. R. 10090) granting a pension to James F. P. Johnston;  
 A bill (H. R. 10095) for the relief of Levi L. Reed;  
 A bill (H. R. 10114) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Ferguson;  
 A bill (H. R. 10122) granting an increase of pension to John S. Burket;  
 A bill (H. R. 10173) granting an increase of pension to Richard Trist;  
 A bill (H. R. 10179) granting an increase of pension to Theron R. Mack;  
 A bill (H. R. 10230) granting an increase of pension to Harrison C. Vore;  
 A bill (H. R. 10255) granting a pension to Margaret Tisdale;  
 A bill (H. R. 10494) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan H. Slocum;  
 A bill (H. R. 10496) granting a pension to James T. Steele;  
 A bill (H. R. 10545) granting an increase of pension to Solomon P. Brockway;

A bill (H. R. 10679) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte E. Baird;  
 A bill (H. R. 10710) granting an increase of pension to Frances E. Scott;  
 A bill (H. R. 10782) granting a pension to Ole Steensland;  
 A bill (H. R. 10925) granting an increase of pension to William Paul;  
 A bill (H. R. 10951) granting an increase of pension to Pauline M. Roberts;  
 A bill (H. R. 11075) granting an increase of pension to Albert J. Hart;  
 A bill (H. R. 11096) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to render judgments for the principal and interest in actions to recover duties collected by the military authorities of the United States upon articles imported into Porto Rico from the several States between April 11, 1899, and May 1, 1900;  
 A bill (H. R. 11112) granting an increase of pension to S. Agnes Young;  
 A bill (H. R. 11117) granting an increase of pension to William T. Hamilton;  
 A bill (H. R. 11168) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Phipps;  
 A bill (H. R. 11180) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Gaskill;  
 A bill (H. R. 11249) granting an increase of pension to Katharine Rains Paul;  
 A bill (H. R. 11271) granting a pension to Louisa Gregg;  
 A bill (H. R. 11314) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Pettit;  
 A bill (H. R. 11493) granting a pension to Mary A. Lipps;  
 A bill (H. R. 11496) granting a pension to Henry S. Foster;  
 A bill (H. R. 11534) granting a pension to Hugh McGuckin;  
 A bill (H. R. 11550) granting an increase of pension to William G. Gray;  
 A bill (H. R. 11578) granting an increase of pension to John Gaston;  
 A bill (H. R. 11636) providing for the transfer of the title to the military reservation at Baton Rouge, La., to the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College;  
 A bill (H. R. 11638) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Hyman;  
 A bill (H. R. 11662) granting an increase of pension to Albion P. Stiles;  
 A bill (H. R. 11737) granting a pension to Irenia C. Hill;  
 A bill (H. R. 11782) granting an increase of pension to Allen Hockenbury;  
 A bill (H. R. 11798) granting an increase of pension to Ole Oleson;  
 A bill (H. R. 11890) granting an increase of pension to James Brown;  
 A bill (H. R. 11894) granting a pension to Hannah A. Timmons;  
 A bill (H. R. 11916) granting an increase of pension to Andrew B. Spurling;  
 A bill (H. R. 11924) granting an increase of pension to Lewis H. Delony;  
 A bill (H. R. 11976) granting a pension to Lucy M. Ferman;  
 A bill (H. R. 12012) granting an increase of pension to Walter C. Tuttle;  
 A bill (H. R. 12028) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Helphinstine;  
 A bill (H. R. 12054) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Burrell;  
 A bill (H. R. 12101) granting a pension to William E. Gray;  
 A bill (H. R. 12116) granting a pension to William A. Hopper, alias Cuff Watson;  
 A bill (H. R. 12115) granting a pension to Chester E. Wadsworth;  
 A bill (H. R. 12129) granting a pension to Minnie M. Rice;  
 A bill (H. R. 12145) granting an increase of pension to Caleb W. Story;  
 A bill (H. R. 12275) granting a pension to Amelia A. Russell;  
 A bill (H. R. 12284) granting an increase of pension to George W. Shaw;  
 A bill (H. R. 12312) granting a pension to Susan Walker;  
 A bill (H. R. 12356) granting a pension to Washington Ojers;  
 A bill (H. R. 12395) granting a pension to Ruth Bartlett;  
 A bill (H. R. 12408) granting an increase of pension to John A. Eveland;  
 A bill (H. R. 12409) granting an increase of pension to Jesse M. Peck;  
 A bill (H. R. 12418) granting a pension to Matilda E. Clarke;  
 A bill (H. R. 12490) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Culbreath;  
 A bill (H. R. 12504) granting a pension to James B. Hashbarger;  
 A bill (H. R. 12549) granting an increase of pension to Ransom Simmons;

A bill (H. R. 12550) granting an increase of pension to James E. Horton;

A bill (H. R. 12552) granting a pension to Erwin A. Burke, alias B. A. Erwin;

A bill (H. R. 12697) granting a pension to M. C. Rogers;

A bill (H. R. 12774) granting an increase of pension to John M. Brown;

A bill (H. R. 12804) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903; and

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 172) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the Morgan Memorial Association, of Winchester, Va., certain Revolutionary trophies at Allegheny Arsenal, Pittsburgh, Pa.

The foregoing pension bills were subsequently read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of Boot and Shoe Workers' Local Union No. 245, American Federation of Labor, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of Boot and Shoe Workers' Local Union No. 245, American Federation of Labor, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented petitions of the Holden Creamery Company, of Holden; of the Creamery Company of Strasburg; of Charles D. Mitchell, of Renick; of A. F. Griner, of California; of the Creamery Company of Amoret; of T. W. Bertenshaw, of Kansas City; of the Creamery Company of Purdin; of the Odessa Creamery Company, of Odessa; of the Creamery Company of Freeman; of W. R. Wilkinson, of St. Louis; of the Flemington Creamery, of Flemington; of the Warrensburg Creamery, of Warrensburg; of the Breckenridge Creamery, of Breckenridge; of the Centerville Creamery, of Centerville; of the Collins Creamery, of Collins; of the Merchants' Exchange, the Missouri State Board of Agriculture, and the State Dairy Association, of St. Louis, all in the State of Missouri, praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of 200 citizens of St. Joseph; of 1,500 citizens of St. Joseph; of 250 citizens of St. Louis; of the Manufacturers' Association of Kansas City; of the Hilmer-Scheitlin Commission Company, of St. Louis; of Hague, Beyer & Co., of Desloge; of Rev. J. A. Hatch, of Kansas City; of J. A. Clark, of Kansas City; of James Kelly, of Kansas City; of Thomas E. Mulvihill, of St. Louis, and of the Manufacturers' Association of Kansas City, all in the State of Missouri, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of Sarah E. Allen, of Kansas City, Mo., together with the affidavit of Dr. H. W. Miller, to accompany the bill (H. R. 3427) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Allen; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of Jesse A. Creekmore, of Company I, Thirty-third Regiment Enrolled Missouri Volunteers, together with the affidavits of Dr. W. L. Brosius, Gideon Gilbreath, and John J. Wampler, to accompany the bill (S. 4581) granting a pension to John A. Creekmore; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SCOTT presented the memorial of Stone Brothers, of Pinegrove, W. Va., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Wheeling Lodge, No. 1, Knights of Fidelity, of Wheeling, W. Va., praying for the enactment of legislation reducing the tax on whisky; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BURROWS presented petitions of Triumph Grange, No. 518, Patrons of Husbandry, of Hersey; of H. J. Flynn and sundry other citizens of Ceresco; of Resort Grange, No. 841, Patrons of Husbandry; of Vanderbilt Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Vanderbilt; of A. W. Fisher, of Fennville, and of Charles B. Welch, of Douglas, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BERRY presented memorials of sundry citizens of Clifty, Ark., remonstrating against the establishment of reciprocity treaties with foreign countries; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DRYDEN presented the memorial of Susan W. Hildreth, of Orange, N. J., remonstrating against the official regulation of vice in the Philippine Islands; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 26, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers of America, of Newark, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Jersey City, N. J., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the New Jersey State Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, praying that an appropriation be made providing for the erection of a suitable monument to mark the battlefield at Princeton, in the State of New Jersey, and for the enactment of legislation to prevent the desecration of the American flag; which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also presented petitions of Painters' Local Union No. 242, of Orange; of the Carpenters' Local Union, of Montclair, and of Painters' Local Union No. 26, of Newark, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Bricklayers and Masons' Local Union No. 24, of Westfield; of Typographical Union No. 433, of Dover; of Cigarmakers' Local Union No. 146, of New Brunswick; of Belleville Council No. 163, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Belleville, and of Mechanics' Home Council No. 71, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Jamesburg, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Rosemont; of L. F. Hersh & Bro., of Elizabeth; of Dr. M. Herbert Simmons, of Orange; of Edward B. Voorhees, of New Brunswick; of James Brock, of Rosenhayn, and of James Butler, of Jersey City, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the memorials of W. M. Babier, of Jersey City; of J. E. Borton, of Camden; of A. T. Egbert, of Ashland; of William A. Hoagland, of Jersey City; of T. J. Schober, of Jersey City; of William J. Terrell, of Burlington; of William H. Axford, of Washington; of J. W. Beach, of Jersey City; of Edward Postel, of Hoboken; of John Worischek, of Hoboken; of C. Postel, of Hoboken; of M. M. Crane, of Boonton; of D. H. Feun, of Jersey City; of Fred Luusmain, of Jersey City; of Mrs. Peterson, of Union Hill; of Dr. E. B. Phelps, of East Orange; of Dr. W. C. Armstrong, of Redbank; of Dr. G. F. Wilbur, of Asbury Park; of Dr. S. E. Robinson, of Newport; of Dr. George E. Titus, of Hightstown; of Dr. M. D. Youngman, of Atlantic City; of Dr. John R. Fleming, of Atlantic City; of Dr. W. M. Moore, of New Brunswick; of Dr. Wallace McGeorge, of Camden; of Dr. Alexander Wilder, of Newark; of Dr. B. W. McFarland, of Trenton; of Dr. George R. Kent, of Newark; of Dr. A. L. Geddes, of Montclair; of Dr. Albert Mayer, of Jersey City Heights; of Dr. H. S. Lockwood, of Jersey City; of C. D. Vincent & Co., of Orange; of Elmer Young, of Orange; of F. Westphal, of Plainfield; of H. Walton, of Asbury Park; of Augustus S. Van Dien, of Jersey City; of F. E. Tilden, of Jersey City; of Therselsen & Brown, of Perth Amboy; of E. W. Turner, of Ridgefield Park; of John J. Reagan, of Jersey City; of Charles Roesch & Sons, of Atlantic City; of P. Pontier, of Passaic; of E. Neelen, of Elizabeth; of George Matthews, of Jersey City; of Mrs. H. Metz, of Jersey City; of Mahon Brothers, of Elizabeth; of W. S. Morton, of Newark; of Henry Ahrens, of Elizabeth; of the New Jersey Melting and Churning Company, of Hoboken; of F. E. La Haeke, of Jersey City; of G. B. Kinsey, of Elizabeth; of Mrs. S. F. Johnson, of Jersey City; of Thomas Hanlon, of Jersey City; of John A. Hooke, of Jersey City; of John S. Gratz & Co., of Camden; of George Cook, of Plainfield; of Mrs. William Chilver, of Jersey City; of Creamer & Rogers, of Burlington; of Bush & Shuart, of Oakland, and of M. Anderson, of Jersey City, all in the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of Cannon Ball Lodge, No. 25, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Beardstown, Ill., praying for the passage of the so-called Foraker Corliss safety-appliance bill; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. NELSON presented petitions of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 77, of Minneapolis; of Coopers' Local Union No. 22, of Minneapolis; of Typographical Union No. 432, of Stillwater; of Upholsterers' Local Union No. 23, of Minneapolis; of Blacksmiths' Local Union No. 108, of Winona; of Local Union No. 81, of Minneapolis; of Butchers' Local Union No. 114, of St. Paul; of Journeymen Stonecutters' Local Union, of Kasota; of Core Makers'

Local Union No. 50, of St. Paul; of Plasterers' Local Union No. 65, of Minneapolis; of Plasterers' Local Union No. 53, of Duluth; of Typographical Local Union, of Winona; of Local Union No. 78, of Duluth; of Iron Molders' Local Union No. 226, of Brainerd, and of Iron Molders' Local Union No. 264, of Winona, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented sundry affidavits in support of the bill (S. 8100) granting an increase of pension to Frank Beekman; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. KITTREDGE presented the petition of John Ryan and 21 other citizens of Kimball, S. Dak., praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Lead City Miners' Union, American Federation of Labor, of Lead, S. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KEAN presented a memorial of Rahway Typographical Union, No. 235, of Rahway, N. J., remonstrating against the passage of the bill (S. 2894) to amend the copyright law; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 148, Boot and Shoe Workers, of Newark, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Dover Typographical Union, No. 433, of Dover, N. J., praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the Joseph Campbell Preserve Company, of Camden, and of the Anderson Food Company, of Camden, in the State of New Jersey, praying for the passage of the so-called pure-food bill; which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented petitions of Local Union No. 119, and of Local Union No. 146, of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Jersey City, in the State of New Jersey, praying for the passage of the so-called Foraker-Corliss safety-appliance bill; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Ashland, Elizabeth, Jersey City, Allentown, Camden, Newark, Rosenhayn, Cranbury, and Keyport, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Jersey City, Newark, Elizabeth, Florence, Perth Amboy, Passaic, Ridgewood, Bayonne, Long Branch, Paterson, Hackettstown, Hoboken, and Camden, all in the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington. I present for the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON], who is necessarily absent from the Senate, a petition from the Chinese Empire Reform Association, of San Francisco, Cal., relative to the use of opium as a drug. I ask that the petition may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEADQUARTERS CHINESE EMPIRE REFORM ASSOCIATION,  
San Francisco, Cal., March 19, 1902.

Senator W. E. MASON,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

HONORED SIR: The members of this association, which was organized and is maintained for the purpose of elevating and civilizing the Chinese people according to the ideas of Western peoples, pray that your excellency will give heed to the following humble prayer:

Realizing that the greatest social and physical destruction of our people may be attributed to the use of that pernicious drug, opium, and also having knowledge of the wonderful increase in the consumption of that same potent poison by the members of your excellency's race in the United States, we hailed with gratitude the notices published in the American newspapers that your excellency had introduced a bill into the Senate of the United States which, when it becomes a law, will forever prohibit the importation of this curse of the earth into the ten times blessed land of your excellency.

It is our earnest prayer to your excellency that you will exert the great power with which your honored people have trusted you to induce the honorable body of which you are a member to pass this more than just law, that our people may learn to pray for the prosperity of the wise men of the West, who, with kindness in their hearts and respect for the great unwritten law of humane consideration uppermost in their minds, will have saved future generations of their own people from the slavery which a powerful nation forced upon the unhappy races of the Far East. For this we pray.

CHINESE EMPIRE REFORM ASSOCIATION,  
T. Y. HEE, Secretary.

Mr. PATTERSON presented a petition of sundry Spanish-American war volunteers of Colorado, praying for the enactment of legislation to allow travel pay from Manila, P. I., to San Fran-

cisco, Cal., to those who enlisted on the call for volunteers for the Spanish-American war; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of Reno Post, No. 39, of Denver; of A. J. Smith Post, No. 102, of Florence, of the Department of Colorado, Grand Army of the Republic, both in the State of Colorado, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented petitions of Typographical Union No. 425, of Canyon City; of Local Division No. 325, Order of Railway Conductors, of Grand Junction; of Local Union No. 77, Order of Railway Telegraphers, of Denver; of Bricklayers' Local Union No. 2, of Pueblo, and of Bricklayers and Masons' Local Union No. 6, of Cripple Creek, all in the State of Colorado, praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Miners' Local Union No. 137, of Black Hawk; of Gillett Mill Smeltermen's Union, No. 92; of Mine and Smeltermen's Local Union No. 58, of Durango; of Bryan Miners' Local Union, No. 64, of Ophir; of Denver Branch, Amalgamated Society of Engineers, of Denver; of the Ten Mile Miners' Union, of Kokomo, and of Miners' Local Union No. 59, of Ward, all in the State of Colorado, praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HARRIS presented a petition of Journeymen Barbers' International Union No. 87, of Leavenworth, Kans., praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Como, Niles, Soldier, and Frederic, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Kansas, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry labor organizations of Salina, Wichita, Pittsburg, Topeka, Osawatomie, Girard, Kansas City, Argentine, Norton, Atchison, and Stippville, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented a memorial of the Lawrenceburg Roller Mills Company, of Lawrenceburg, Ind., remonstrating against the adoption of the so-called "London clause" in bills of lading issued to London from North Atlantic ports; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of 67 citizens of Newport, R. I., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the erection of a monument, in the city of Washington, to the memory of the late Prof. Spencer F. Baird; which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also presented a petition of 18 citizens of Providence, R. I., and a petition of the Brewery Workers' Local Union No. 116, American Federation of Labor, of Providence, R. I., praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MITCHELL presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce, of Manila, P. I., praying for the enactment of certain legislation for the government of the Philippine Islands; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented a petition of the Progressive Commercial Association, of Astoria, Ore., and a petition of Local Division No. 1, United Brotherhood of Railway Employees, of Roseburg, Ore., praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Local Division No. 1, United Brotherhood of Railway Employees, of Roseburg, Ore., praying for the establishment of a post-office savings department; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Pleasant Hill, Ore., praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 487, of Baker City; of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 202, of Portland; of Expressmen and Team Drivers' Local Union No. 197, of Portland; of Hardwood Finishers' Local Union No. 187, of Portland; of Local Union No. 143, of Portland; of Journeymen Barbers' Local Union No. 75, of Portland; of Local Union No. 167, of Astoria; of Local Union No. 41, of Portland, and of Team Drivers' Local Union No. 182, of Astoria, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Oregon, praying for

the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SPOONER presented a petition of H. W. Lawton Camp, No. 6, Spanish-American War Veterans, of Manitowoc, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the desecration of the American flag; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Painters' District Council, American Federation of Labor, of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Retail Merchants' Association, of Menomonie, Wis., praying for the passage of the so-called pure-food bill; which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented a memorial of the Retail Merchants' Association, of Menomonie, Wis., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. DUBOIS. I present a petition of the Creek Nation of Indians, praying for the adoption of a proposed amendment to the Indian appropriation bill relative to the granting of annuities to these Indians. I move that the petition be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DUBOIS presented a petition of the Farmers' Institute, of Riverside, Idaho, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the reclamation of the arid lands of the West; which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also presented petitions of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 380, of Wallace; of the Miners' Local Union of De Lamar, and of Miners' Local Union No. 37, of Giffonsville, all in the State of Idaho, praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Burke, Ovid, and Liberty, all in the State of Idaho, praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FOSTER of Louisiana presented petitions of Iron Molders' Local Union No. 367, of New Orleans; of Journeymen Bakers and Confectioners' Local Union No. 35, of New Orleans; of Blacksmiths' Local Union No. 42, of New Orleans; of Butchers' Workmen Protective Union No. 146, of New Orleans; of Team Drivers' Local Union No. 254, of New Orleans; of Operative Plasterers' Local Union No. 211, of Shreveport; of Cigar Packers' Local Union No. 479, of New Orleans, and of Core Makers' Local Union No. 76, of New Orleans, all in the State of Louisiana, praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FORAKER presented a petition of 61 citizens of Rushsylvania, Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented petitions of 126 citizens of Uhrichsville, Denison, Salineville, Toronto, and Tippecanoe; of 728 citizens of Cuyahoga Falls, Akron, Payne, Palmyra, Collinwood, Randolph, Columbus, Orrville, and Wanda, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Lake Seamen's Union of Cleveland, Ohio, remonstrating against the adoption of certain proposed amendments to chapter 7 of the Revised Statutes relating to the employment of seamen in the merchant marine of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of the congregations of the Third United Presbyterian Church of Xenia, of the African Methodist Episcopal Church of Xenia, of the First United Brethren Church of Xenia, and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Dresden, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the sale of opium and intoxicating liquors in the island possessions of the United States; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Barlow Post, No. 494, of Barlow; of Wilson Post, No. 602, of Vienna Crossroads; of J. G. Reethmille Post, No. 658, of Hannibal; of C. P. Ogden Post, No. 569, of Nova; of Sergeant Thompson Post, No. 235, of Salineville, and of William Bush Post, No. 455, of Racine, all of the Department of Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic; of Carpenters' Local Union No. 494, of Columbus; of Brewery Workers' Local Union No. 140, of Portsmouth, and of Stereotypers and Electrotypers' Local Union No. 14, of Columbus, all in the State of Ohio, praying for

the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented memorials of the joint advisory board of the Cigar Makers' and Packers' unions of Cincinnati, and of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 249, of Findlay, in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on cigars and tobacco imported into the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Iron Molders' Union No. 4, American Federation of Labor, of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict the application of the writ of injunction, to establish a uniform working day of eight hours, to prohibit interstate commerce in convict-made goods, and for the exclusion of Chinese immigrants to this country; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Local Unions Nos. 34, 6, 30, 60, 421, 10, 68, 105, 56, 189, 50, 31, and 210, of Martins Ferry, Columbus, Youngstown, Akron, Zanesville, Cincinnati, and Cleveland, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of 98 citizens of Canton; of 59 citizens of Fostoria; of 98 citizens of Cleveland; of 38 citizens of Cincinnati; of 27 citizens of Middlebranch; of 44 citizens of Springfield; of 203 citizens of Cincinnati; of 48 citizens of Mansfield; and of Local Union No. 371, United Mine Workers of America, of Byesville; of Carpenters' Local Union No. 589, of Chillicothe; of Bricklayers' Union No. 16, of Xenia; of Retail Clerks' Union No. 94, of Canton; of Bricklayers' Union No. 7, of Akron; of Bricklayers' Union No. 21, of Columbus; of Machine Coopers' Union No. 109, of Cincinnati; of Journeymen Bakers and Confectioners' Union No. 41, of Columbus; of Stereo and Electro Union No. 14, of Columbus; of Sole Fasteners' Union No. 218, of Cincinnati; of Shirt, Waist, and Laundry Workers' Union No. 25, of East Liverpool; of Typographical Union No. 182, of Akron; of Local Union No. 130, of Toledo; of Beer Drivers and Stablemen's Union No. 202, of Columbus; of International Association of Allied Metal Mechanics' Union No. 117, of Chillicothe; of Carpenters' Union No. 61, of Columbus; of Stereo and Electro Union No. 14, of Columbus; of Order of Railway Conductors, Local Division No. 295, of Lorain; of Union No. 43, of Urbana; of Order of Railway Conductors, Local Division No. 26, of Toledo; of Stove Mounters' Union No. 8, of Hamilton; of Federal Union, No. 7503, of Byesville; of Red Prince Lodge, No. 250, Knights of Pythias, of Byesville; of Lodge No. 765, of Byesville; of J. M. Ferris Lodge, No. 132, of Cleveland; of Stereotypers' Union No. 5, of Cincinnati, and of Typographical Union No. 200, of Youngstown, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of 74 citizens of Oak Harbor, Ottawa, and Kenton; of 45 citizens of German, of 46 citizens of Benton Station, 44 citizens of Huntsburg, 47 citizens of Fullertown, of 22 citizens of Fields, 44 citizens of Ravenna, 47 citizens of Oak Harbor, 42 citizens of Wildare, 43 citizens of Alvordton, 25 citizens of Eaton, 48 citizens of Vienna, 24 citizens of Deerfield, 29 citizens of West Mansfield, 27 citizens of Chesterland, 21 citizens of Glendale, 77 citizens of Cedarville, 25 citizens of Cincinnati, 25 citizens of Hamilton County, 42 citizens of Hardin and Jefferson counties, 55 citizens of Preble County; of Mount Nebo Grange, No. 664, Patrons of Husbandry, of Lisbon, and of Bradford Grange, No. 877, Patrons of Husbandry, of London, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HAWLEY presented petitions of 20 citizens of New Haven; of Cigar Makers' Local Union of Bridgeport; of Journeymen Bakers and Confectioners' Local Union of Torrington; of Carpenters and Joiners' Union of New Haven; of Hat Makers' Union of Danbury; of Hatters' Union of Bethel; of Journeymen Bakers and Confectioners' Local Union of Danbury; of Coremakers' Union of New Haven; of Team Drivers' International Union of Danbury; of Stereotypers' Union of New Haven; of Team Drivers' International Union of Meriden; of Journeymen Bakers' National Union of Hartford, and of Bakers and Confectioners' Local Union of Bridgeport, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Cigar Makers' Union of Hartford; of Cigar Makers' Union of New Haven; of Cigar Makers' Union of South Norwalk; of Typographical Union of Hartford; of Typographical Union of Danbury; of Iron Molders' Union of Stamford; of Iron Molders' Union of Shelton; of Brewers' Union of Waterbury; of Brewers' Union of Hartford; of Cigar Makers' Union of Ansonia; of Iron Molders' Union of Bridgeport; of

Iron Molders' Union of Hartford; of Tile Layers and Helpers' International Union of Hartford; of Iron Molders' Union of Middletown; of Switchmen's Union of New Haven; of Team Drivers' International Union of Danbury; of Coremakers' Union of New Haven; of Journeymen Bakers and Confectioners' Local Union No. 188, of Torrington; of Typographical Union of New Haven; of Typographical Union of Bridgeport; of Typographical Union of Waterbury; of Journeymen Barbers' International Union of South Norwalk; of Piano and Organ Workers' Union of Meriden, and of Journeymen Bakers and Confectioners' Local Union of Hartford, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of the Maine State Board of Trade, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the present bankruptcy law; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the general committee of the telegraphers, station agents, and signalmen of the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad Company, remonstrating against the adoption of the enacting clause of Senate bill No. 4553, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Lighting Fixture Association, of New York, remonstrating against the ratification of the so-called French reciprocity treaty; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of Ramon Rivera and 227 other citizens of Corozal, Porto Rico, praying for the restoration of the municipal government of that city; which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

#### ARTICLES ON THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. MONEY. I ask the consent of the Senate to have printed as a Senate document observations made by a member of this body during a visit to the Philippine Islands. The articles were published in the Saturday Evening Post, of Philadelphia, and I have the permission of the publishers to have the articles printed as a public document. One article is entitled "Will the Philippines pay?" and the other, "The real feelings of the Filipinos."

Mr. LODGE. What are the papers?

Mr. MONEY. The articles I desire to have published were contributed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] to the Saturday Evening Post, being the result of personal observations after a considerable visit to the Philippines.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi that the articles referred to by him be published as a document? The Chair hears none, and that order is made.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 1714) granting an increase of pension to Levi H. Winslow;

A bill (H. R. 1190) granting an increase of pension to Albert S. Whittier;

A bill (H. R. 6438) granting an increase of pension to Matthew C. Medbury;

A bill (H. R. 1503) granting an increase of pension to Michael Farrell; and

A bill (S. 4740) granting an increase of pension to Maria L. Godfrey.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 10289) granting a pension to Eliza Stewart;

A bill (H. R. 1706) granting an increase of pension to John E. White;

A bill (H. R. 10193) granting an increase of pension to John Hollister;

A bill (S. 4749) granting an increase of pension to Eunice A. Smith; and

A bill (S. 3091) granting an increase of pension to Matilda R. Schoonmaker.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 319) granting a pension to Ida Warren, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. TURNER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2289) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin S. Harrower;

A bill (H. R. 5413) granting an increase of pension to Alfred H. Van Vliet;

A bill (H. R. 3180) granting an increase of pension to Edward S. Dickinson; and

A bill (H. R. 7990) granting an increase of pension to Uriah Reams.

Mr. TURNER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 6687) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo Blackman;

A bill (H. R. 3275) granting an increase of pension to William G. Johnson;

A bill (H. R. 2770) granting an increase of pension to Otilia M. Smoot;

A bill (H. R. 8696) granting an increase of pension to William B. Rowe;

A bill (H. R. 918) granting an increase of pension to Charles Misner;

A bill (H. R. 5327) granting an increase of pension to William H. Mackey; and

A bill (H. R. 10141) granting an increase of pension to William R. Armstrong.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11381) granting an increase of pension to Abraham N. Bradfield, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PATTERSON, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 4514) granting an increase of pension to Mary Beals;

A bill (S. 3108) granting an increase of pension to Inez E. Perrine; and

A bill (S. 2943) granting a pension to Thomas S. Rowen.

Mr. PATTERSON, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4381) granting an increase of pension to John S. Robinson, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by himself on the 18th instant, proposing to appropriate \$100,000 to enable the Secretary of War to begin the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. DEBOE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 181) granting an increase of pension to William C. David;

A bill (S. 3672) granting an increase of pension to James Scannell;

A bill (H. R. 9791) granting an increase of pension to John Reep;

A bill (H. R. 8048) granting an increase of pension to James A. Bramble;

A bill (H. R. 2545) granting an increase of pension to Isaac H. Crim;

A bill (H. R. 7250) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Hendry; and

A bill (H. R. 1278) granting an increase of pension to La Myra V. Kendig.

Mr. DEBOE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9301) granting an increase of pension to Barbara McDonald, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6029) granting a pension to Mary E. Kelly, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. LODGE. I am directed by the Committee on the Philippines, to whom was referred to bill (S. 2295) temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes, to report it with amendments, and I submit a report thereon. I hope to be able to call up the bill at an early day and dispose of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. RAWLINS. In behalf of the minority members of the Committee on the Philippines I present an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill which has just been favorably reported. I ask that it be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The substitute will be printed, necessarily.

Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were

referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 283) granting an increase of pension to Robert M. McCullough;

A bill (H. R. 8553) granting a pension to Joseph Tusinski;

A bill (H. R. 809) granting an increase of pension to James P. Burchfield;

A bill (H. R. 9621) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Y. Transue;

A bill (H. R. 1938) granting an increase of pension to Helen V. Rorer;

A bill (H. R. 5761) granting a pension to Thomas F. Walter; and

A bill (H. R. 8651) granting a pension to Maggie Helmbold.

Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 3041) granting an increase of pension to Emma F. Shilling; and

A bill (S. 4506) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Collier.

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by himself on the 19th instant, intended to be proposed to the bill (S. 493) to amend the code of law for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901, reported adversely thereon; and the amendment was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4483) to amend section 553 of an act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was indefinitely postponed.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by himself on the 13th instant, proposing to appropriate \$8,000 for a survey for an additional conduit for the Washington water supply, intended to be proposed to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, submitted a favorable report thereon, and moved that the amendment be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom the subject was referred, submitted a report, accompanied by a bill (S. 4792), relative to the control of dogs in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 6466) granting a pension to Josephine M. Dustin; and

A bill (H. R. 2124) granting an increase of pension to Dewit C. McCoy.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 4643) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe L. Peyton; and

A bill (S. 4056) granting an increase of pension to Minerva Melton.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 3634) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Capehart;

A bill (H. R. 3418) granting a pension to Dennis Dyer; and

A bill (H. R. 11375) granting a pension to Charles F. Merrill.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8471) granting a pension to Eliza A. Wright, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PRITCHARD, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1625) granting an increase of pension to Jethro M. Getman; and

A bill (S. 4335) granting an increase of pension to John Brown.

Mr. PRITCHARD, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 5712) granting a pension to Alice Bozeman; and

A bill (H. R. 2287) granting an increase of pension to George McDaniel.

Mr. PRITCHARD, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4221) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to extinguish a portion of an alley in square 189, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CARMACK, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6713) granting an increase of pension

to Freeman R. E. Chanaberry, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10692) granting an increase of pension to David C. Maples, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. TALIAFERRO, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1225) granting a pension to Clara W. McNair, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10415) granting a pension to Sarah M. Smith, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 4793) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Claiborne; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4794) to restore to the active list of the Navy the name of Andrew M. Moore; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 4795) granting a pension to George W. Johnson; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. To accompany the bill I present the petition for pension of George W. Johnson, with affidavits of Dr. O. F. Renick, A. O. Welton, T. D. Rafter, and Thomas Cameron and War Department letter. I move that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 4796) granting an increase of pension to Robert B. Drake; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. To accompany the bill I present the petition for increase of pension of Robert B. Drake, Company B, Ninety-ninth Ohio Volunteer Infantry, with affidavit of Dr. J. S. Cookes. I move that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Claims.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 4797) granting an increase of pension to William H. Colville; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. To accompany the bill I present the petition for increase of pension of William H. Colville, Company F, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, with affidavits of Thomas J. Ireland and Dr. Joel S. Cooper. I move that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 4798) to authorize the Quincy Railroad Bridge Company, its successors and assigns, to rebuild the draw span of its bridge across the Mississippi River, at Quincy, Ill.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 4799) for the relief of Annie T. Jones, widow of Jonathan L. Jones, deceased; which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PATTERSON introduced a bill (S. 4800) granting an honorable discharge to Andrew Heradon; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 4801) granting an increase of pension to Augustus C. Paul;

A bill (S. 4802) granting a pension to John Allen Alcorn (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 4803) granting a pension to Marsden H. Sammis (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 4804) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo W. Smith (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 4805) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Wilsey (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 4806) granting an increase of pension to Frank A. Olney (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. DUBOIS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 4807) granting an increase of pension to Emmett C. Hill (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 4808) granting a pension to George W. Soule (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 4809) granting a pension to Henry J. McFadden (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 4810) granting an increase of pension to Wade P. Hard (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. HARRIS introduced a bill (S. 4811) granting an increase of pension to John W. Dick; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MALLORY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

- A bill (S. 4812) granting a pension to Addison Arnold;
- A bill (S. 4813) granting a pension to Chesterfield Basford; and
- A bill (S. 4814) granting a pension to Amanda Pitman.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 4815) to grant certain lands to the South Platte Canal and Reservoir Company; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. McENERY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

- A bill (S. 4816) for the relief of the heirs of John Nelson;
- A bill (S. 4817) for the relief of Louis Dubroc;
- A bill (S. 4818) for the relief of the heirs of Archibald P. Buchholz; and
- A bill (S. 4819) for the relief of the widow and heirs of James Hughes.

Mr. DEBOE introduced a bill (S. 4820) to correct the military record of Samuel T. Wallace; which was read twice by its title, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

- A bill (S. 4821) granting an increase of pension to William G. Mandeville (with accompanying papers);
- A bill (S. 4822) granting an increase of pension to Moses Hull;
- A bill (S. 4823) granting an increase of pension to John C. Parker; and
- A bill (S. 4824) granting a pension to Susan A. Brand (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 4825) to provide for a union railroad station in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4826) for the relief of holders and owners of certain District of Columbia special-tax scrip; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4827) granting an increase of pension to George W. Stott; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 4828) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Craigue; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 4829) granting an increase of pension to Nimrod Headington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 4830) granting an increase of pension to Sarah D. Graves; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4831) granting an increase of pension to Horace H. Redford; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CLAPP introduced a bill (S. 4832) for the relief of Col. H. B. Freeman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FORAKER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

- A bill (S. 4833) granting a pension to Israel Heffner (with accompanying papers);
- A bill (S. 4834) granting an increase of pension to James Gaines (with an accompanying paper);
- A bill (S. 4835) granting an increase of pension to James Brown (with accompanying papers);
- A bill (S. 4836) granting an increase of pension to John Mendenhall (with accompanying papers);
- A bill (S. 4837) granting an increase of pension to David J. Nunemaker (with an accompanying paper);
- A bill (S. 4838) granting an increase of pension to John Miller (with accompanying papers);
- A bill (S. 4839) granting an increase of pension to Richard Cramer (with accompanying papers); and
- A bill (S. 4840) granting an increase of pension to Elias Broadstone (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 4841) to correct the naval record of and grant an honorable discharge to Edward Pritchard;

which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4842) for the relief of William Wiggins; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4843) for the relief of the estate of Charles McIntosh, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

- A bill (S. 4844) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James Knight;
- A bill (S. 4845) to correct the military record of Thomas Ross;
- A bill (S. 4846) granting an honorable discharge to Joseph Shuman; and
- A bill (S. 4847) to correct the military record of James Petty.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut introduced a bill (S. 4848) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Choctaw and Chickasaw tribes of Indians, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. SPOONER introduced a bill (S. 4849) granting an increase of pension to Lovell Bullock; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 4850) to increase the pensions of soldiers and sailors who have lost limbs in the service; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PETTUS introduced a bill (S. 4851) for the relief of Richard Appling; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. RAWLINS introduced a bill (S. 4852) granting a pension to Loyd B. Stephens; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 4853) granting an increase of pension to Amos Moulton; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 4854) granting an increase of pension to Cassius B. Fisher; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4855) granting an increase of pension to John F. Dearborn; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 73) authorizing the President to restore and appoint Hamilton H. Blunt to be captain of infantry, United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment proposing to increase the number of special agents in charge of divisions in the rural free-delivery service from 7 to 10, and providing compensation therefor, intended to be proposed by him to the Post-Office appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$500,000 to enable the Postmaster-General to make contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes, intended to be proposed by him to the Post-Office appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment relative to the report of the board of engineers appointed for the improvement of the harbor of refuge at Sandy Bay, Cape Ann, Massachusetts, as to whether the original project be approved or the same be modified and whether the appropriation made for the improvement of this harbor be expended on the original or on the modified project, intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment providing conditions whereby the Postmaster-General is authorized and directed to expend certain appropriations as may be necessary to test the practicability of performing rural free-delivery service by contract, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Post-Office appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HANSBROUGH submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$1,000,000 for the construction and maintenance of suitable buildings at military posts and stations already established and occupied for the conduct of the exchange store, school,

library, reading, lunch, and amusement rooms, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$875,000 to pay the difference between the cost of the ration at 25 cents per day and the amount of 27½ cents per day to be issued to the company or detachment commander of each company or detachment for each enlisted man while present for duty with his command, and to the surgeon in charge of a hospital for the sick while under his care in the proportion of 75 cents per month per man, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$25,000 as an additional appropriation for acquiring by purchase or condemnation the land in the square surrounding Fort Constitution, at Newcastle, N. H., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MONEY submitted an amendment providing for a survey of Horn Island Pass, Mississippi, with a view of obtaining a channel through said pass, intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$50,000 for continuing the improvement of Pascagoula River, Mississippi, with a view of obtaining a 17-foot channel from 8 miles above the mouth of Dog River, intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FAIRBANKS submitted an amendment providing for a survey of the Ohio River below the mouth of Salt River, with a view to the construction of a movable dam, so as to make a harbor at New Albany, Ind., and Louisville, Ky., of an average depth of 6 feet below the Ohio Falls, intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CARMACK submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$50,000 for the improvement of the mountain section of the Tennessee River, intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BACON. On behalf of the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], who is necessarily detained from the Senate, I submit an amendment proposing to appropriate \$25,000 for the improvement of Ashley River, South Carolina, intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill. I move that the amendment be printed and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

#### BOOK AGENTS OF METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH SOUTH.

On motion of Mr. COCKRELL, it was

Ordered, That 600 copies of Senate Report No. 1445, Fifty-fifth Congress, third session, made by Mr. TELLER, from the Committee on Claims, January 9, 1899, being a letter from the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church South dated August 26, 1898, relating to the claim of the book agents of that church, be reprinted for the use of the Senate and placed in the document room.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (H. R. 1592) for the relief of F. M. Vowells;

A bill (H. R. 2316) to correct the military record of Albert Baker;

A bill (H. R. 2901) to remove the charge of desertion borne opposite the name of Abram Williams;

A bill (H. R. 3979) to correct the military record of Calvin A. Rice;

A bill (H. R. 3442) to correct the military record of John O'Brien;

A bill (H. R. 10095) for the relief of Levi L. Reed;

A bill (H. R. 11636) providing for the transfer of the title to the military reservation at Baton Rouge, La., to the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College;

A bill (H. R. 12804) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903; and

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 172) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the Morgan Memorial Association, of Winchester, Va., certain Revolutionary trophies at Allegheny Arsenal, Pittsburg, Pa.

The bill (H. R. 9037) to allow the commutation of homestead entry in certain cases was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The bill (H. R. 11096) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of

Claims to render judgments for the principal and interest in actions to recover duties collected by the military authorities of the United States upon articles imported into Porto Rico from the several States between April 11, 1899, and May 1, 1900, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

#### PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 28th instant approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

An act (S. 8) granting a pension to Sara B. Andrews;  
 An act (S. 502) granting a pension to Alexander Beachboard;  
 An act (S. 628) granting a pension to Annie D. Taggart;  
 An act (S. 665) granting a pension to Kate Pearce;  
 An act (S. 713) granting a pension to Frances E. Stebbins;  
 An act (S. 1041) granting a pension to Abbie M. Packard;  
 An act (S. 1086) granting a pension to Charlotte H. Race;  
 An act (S. 1139) granting a pension to Abby Clark McNett;  
 An act (S. 1146) granting a pension to Adela S. Webster;  
 An act (S. 1331) granting a pension to Ann Eliza Trout;  
 An act (S. 1933) granting a pension to Ella Bailey;  
 An act (S. 1940) granting a pension to Frances Fuller Victor;  
 An act (S. 2562) granting a pension to Emma R. Pawling;  
 An act (S. 2701) granting a pension to Thomas G. Foster;  
 An act (S. 2802) granting a pension to Martha R. Osbourn;  
 An act (S. 3021) granting a pension to India Stewart;  
 An act (S. 3258) granting a pension to Simeon Partridge;  
 An act (S. 3284) granting a pension to Gilbert P. Howe;  
 An act (S. 335) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Barnum;  
 An act (S. 462) granting an increase of pension to Ann Demonbrun;  
 An act (S. 469) granting an increase of pension to Hiram H. Kingsbury;  
 An act (S. 577) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Burch;  
 An act (S. 1015) granting an increase of pension to Israel A. Benner;  
 An act (S. 1135) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Stowers;  
 An act (S. 1164) granting an increase of pension to Lewis W. Moore;  
 An act (S. 1195) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Bridgman;  
 An act (S. 1467) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia A. McKenney;  
 An act (S. 1626) granting an increase of pension to Michael Samelsberger;  
 An act (S. 1641) granting an increase of pension to Frank J. Clark;  
 An act (S. 1748) granting an increase of pension to Williamanna E. Lynde;  
 An act (S. 1800) granting an increase of pension to Jennie C. Ruckle;  
 An act (S. 1802) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia E. Wright;  
 An act (S. 1913) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Michler;  
 An act (S. 2008) granting an increase of pension to Peter C. Monfort;  
 An act (S. 2013) granting an increase of pension to Sidley Leland;  
 An act (S. 2049) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Taylor;  
 An act (S. 2100) granting an increase of pension to John McGrath;  
 An act (S. 2267) granting an increase of pension to Clara A. Penrose;  
 An act (S. 2303) granting an increase of pension to Noah F. Chafee;  
 An act (S. 2394) granting an increase of pension to Sybil F. Hall;  
 An act (S. 2423) granting an increase of pension to John W. Burnham;  
 An act (S. 2440) granting an increase of pension to John W. Gregg;  
 An act (S. 2468) granting an increase of pension to Horatio N. Francis;  
 An act (S. 2520) granting an increase of pension to Emma McLaughlin;  
 An act (S. 2531) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Scott;  
 An act (S. 2643) granting an increase of pension to Peter C. Cleek;

An act (S. 2692) granting an increase of pension to Lucy W. Smith;

An act (S. 2732) granting an increase of pension to Marie J. Smyth.

An act (S. 2767) granting an increase of pension to Albert D. Scovell;

An act (S. 2867) granting an increase of pension to John A. Hazelton;

An act (S. 2929) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Barton;

An act (S. 2930) granting an increase of pension to Franklin B. Delaney;

An act (S. 2947) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Shaw;

An act (S. 3026) granting an increase of pension to Marie U. Nordstrom;

An act (S. 3036) granting an increase of pension to Jason Leighton;

An act (S. 3054) granting an increase of pension to Alice DeK. Shattuck;

An act (S. 3097) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Nunez;

An act (S. 3182) granting an increase of pension to Mary Louise Worden;

An act (S. 3257) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth K. Prescott;

An act (S. 3269) granting an increase of pension to Jane E. Tompkins;

An act (S. 3322) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Clough;

An act (S. 3328) granting an increase of pension to Heber C. Griffin;

An act (S. 3329) granting an increase of pension to Annie McElheney;

An act (S. 3403) granting an increase of pension to George M. Emery;

An act (S. 3482) granting an increase of pension to Ida C. Emery;

An act (S. 3553) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Van Wormer;

An act (S. 3559) granting an increase of pension to George E. Houghton;

An act (S. 3704) granting an increase of pension to Frederick E. Rogers; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 21) authorizing the printing of extra copies of the Annual Report of the Commissioner of Pensions.

The message also announced that the President of the United States had, on the 29th instant, approved and signed the act (S. 3865) to establish light-houses at the mouth of Boston Harbor to mark the entrance to the new Broad Sound Channel.

#### ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT JUDGE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed and the Calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 3220) providing for an additional circuit judge in the seventh judicial district. I think there will be no discussion about it.

Mr. HALE. Let us first take up the Calendar in regular order. After we have proceeded with the Calendar, if the Senator has reason for calling up this bill it can be done, but let us go first to the Calendar.

Mr. CULLOM. It will take less time to pass the bill than to discuss the order of business. I hope it will be considered now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Calendar is before the Senate, and the bill called up by the Senator from Illinois was passed over without prejudice on a former day.

Mr. HALE. That is right, if it belongs to that class.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read.

The Secretary read the bill, and the Senate as in Committee of the Whole proceeded to its consideration. It provides that there shall be in the seventh circuit an additional circuit judge, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall possess the same qualifications, and shall have the same powers and jurisdiction and receive the same compensation now prescribed by law in respect to the present circuit judges.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third times, and passed.

#### BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 167) for the relief of John L. Smithmeyer and Paul J. Pelz was announced as next in order.

Mr. LODGE. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being made, the bill goes over. Shall it go over without prejudice, retaining its place?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will retain its place. The bill (S. 2992) to ratify an agreement with the Sioux tribe of Indians of the Rosebud Reservation, in South Dakota, and making appropriation to carry the same into effect, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill has been read in full. Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. This bill can not be disposed of under the five-minute rule. I am willing that it shall go over for to-day, keeping its place on the Calendar, but unless the amendment which I proposed is assented to it will have eventually to go over under Rule IX, when we can have a full discussion of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will go over this morning, retaining its place.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Yes.

The bill (S. 1792) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to navigation of vessels, bills of lading, and to certain obligations, duties, and rights in connection with the carriage of property" was next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. HALE. By agreement that bill is to go over, retaining its place.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will retain its place. The bill (H. R. 3110) to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans was next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. HALE. That bill will go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2960) to prohibit the coming into and to regulate the residence within the United States, its Territories, and all possessions and all territory under its jurisdiction, and the District of Columbia, of Chinese persons and persons of Chinese descent was next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. GALLINGER. That will likewise go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1919) fixing fees of jurors and witnesses in the United States courts in the State of Wyoming was announced as next in order, and was read.

Mr. SPOONER. Who reported the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator is not in his seat. I ask that the bill may go over without losing its place on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill goes over, retaining its place.

The bill (S. 1694) to provide for compensation for certain employees of the Treasury, War, and Navy departments was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. HALE. That should go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being made, the bill goes over, retaining its place.

#### ESTATE OF A. G. BOONE.

The bill (S. 1594) for the relief of the legal representatives of A. G. Boone was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to the legal representatives of A. G. Boone, of Laveta, Colo., \$12,291, in full satisfaction for his services and expenses as United States commissioner in negotiating the Indian treaty concluded February 18, 1861, whereby certain valuable and extensive Indian territory was acquired by the United States.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### THIERMAN & FROST.

The bill (S. 4074) for the relief of Thierman & Frost was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill has been heretofore read in full as in Committee of the Whole. The amendment of the Committee on Claims will be read.

The Secretary proceeded to read the amendment, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert a substitute.

Mr. ALLISON. I think the bill should be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be passed over without prejudice?

Mr. ALLISON. Without prejudice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will retain its place.

#### ELEONORA G. GOLDSBOROUGH.

The bill (S. 3421) for the relief of Eleonora G. Goldsborough was next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. BURNHAM. I desire that the bill may go over without prejudice, retaining its place.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill goes over, retaining its place.

#### EDWARD HAINES AND OTHERS.

The bill (S. 4306) for the relief of Edward Haines, John Haugland, Wallace L. Reed, W. D. Davis, Martin Monson, Johann Bottjer, and the legal representatives of J. P. Ferwerda, deceased, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to

pay to Edward Haines, keeper of the Galveston life-saving station, and to John Haugland, Wallace L. Reed, and W. D. Davis, surfmen at that station, and Martin Monson, temporary surfman, and the legal representatives of J. P. Ferwerda, deceased, late temporary surfman at that station, and to Johann Bottjer, keeper of the San Luis life-saving station, such sums, respectively, as shall, on due inquiry by the General Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service, be found to be a just compensation to them for the loss in the Galveston hurricane of September 8, 1900, of such property belonging to them, respectively, as was necessary to be kept by them at said life-saving stations, from considerations of health, decency, and the nature of the service.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Let the report be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read.

The Secretary proceeded to read the report submitted by Mr. MALLORY on the 20th instant and read as follows:

The Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4306) for the relief of Edward Haines, John Haugland, Wallace L. Reed, W. D. Davis, Martin Monson, Johann Bottjer, and the legal representatives of J. P. Ferwerda, deceased, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it pass.

The bill has the approval of the Treasury Department, as will appear by the following letters, which, with accompanying papers, annexed hereto, fully present the facts in the case.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, March 13, 1902.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 5th instant, transmitting Senate bill 4306, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session, "for the relief of Edward Haines, John Haugland, Wallace L. Reed, W. D. Davis, Martin Monson, Johann Bottjer, and the legal representatives of J. P. Ferwerda, deceased," for suggestions touching the merits of the bill and the propriety of its passage.

The matter was referred to the General Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service for report, which has been received and is herewith transmitted with my concurrence.

Respectfully,

L. M. SHAW,  
Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,  
United States Senate.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT OF LIFE-SAVING SERVICE,  
Washington, March 12, 1902.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge your reference for report of the letter from the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, dated the 5th instant, transmitting Senate bill 4306, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session, for the relief of Edward Haines, John Haugland, Wallace L. Reed, W. D. Davis, Martin Monson, Johann Bottjer, and the legal representatives of J. P. Ferwerda, deceased, and asking for suggestions touching the merits of the bill and the propriety of its passage.

The bill provides for payment to the persons mentioned of such sums, respectively, as shall on due inquiry by the General Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service be found to be a just compensation for the loss in the Galveston hurricane of September 8, 1900, of such property as was necessary to be kept by them at the life-saving stations from considerations of health, decency, and the nature of the service, and makes it the duty of the General Superintendent, after the approval of the act, to ascertain and report to the Secretary of the Treasury the sums payable to each of said persons under the provisions of the act.

Affidavits containing schedules of the property lost by the persons mentioned upon the occasion in question have been forwarded to this office, and copies of the same are transmitted herewith. It will be observed from the summary (herewith inclosed) that the claims as presented (allowance being made for error in addition) amount to \$2,515.74.

The articles which appear to have been kept at the stations "from considerations of health, decency, and the nature of the service" have been separated from such as appear to have been kept there from choice and for personal convenience, and are indicated in the accompanying schedules in such a way as to admit of easy reference. The value of the articles of the first class is shown to be \$903.49, and of those of the second class, \$1,912.25.

Of the justice and equity of making reimbursement for the loss of the first class of articles, which is provided for in the bill, I think there can be no doubt. The second class stands, perhaps, on a somewhat different footing.

As the schedules herewith contain full information and data, and probably all the evidence obtainable, it is suggested that the bill might be amended, if deemed desirable, by specifying the amount to be allowed in each case. If, however, the question is left for this office to determine, its probable action in the premises is indicated in the accompanying papers.

In this connection I would call attention to the fact that in the deficiency appropriation acts of September 30, 1890 (26 Stat. L., p. 510), and March 2, 1895 (28 Stat. L., p. 849), provision was made for reimbursement of the crews of the Muskeget and Cahoon's Hollow life-saving stations, respectively, for such of their personal property lost by the burning of the stations as appeared to have been kept there from considerations of health, decency, and the nature of the service, excluding such as was kept from choice or for personal convenience.

Respectfully,

S. I. KIMBALL,  
General Superintendent.

The SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I do not care for a further reading of the report. I should like to inquire as to what amount is appropriated in the bill?

Mr. MALLORY. The amount is reduced to \$603.49 and the claims are cut down to that sum.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Let the bill be again read.

The bill was again read.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROTECTION OF MINERS IN THE TERRITORIES.

The bill (H. R. 8327) to amend an act entitled "An act for the protection of the lives of miners in the Territories" was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. The Senator who reported that bill is not present. It is a House bill, and the report shows that the committee recommended the striking out of some portion of the bill and inserting something else in lieu of the part which was proposed to be stricken out; but the printed copy of the bill I have as reported does not indicate the amendment which the committee says ought to be adopted in lieu of the matter stricken out.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill as now printed shows the amendment.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Very well. Then I have nothing to say about it.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Mines and Mining with an amendment, on page 2, line 4, after the word "gases," to strike out:

And all workings shall be kept clear of standing gas. All owners, lessees, operators of, or any other person having the control or management of any coal shaft, drift, slope, or pit employing miners to work therein shall employ shot flirers to fire the shots therein. Said shots shall be fired once a day on each day when any such shaft, slope, drift, or pit is in operation, but shall not be fired until after all miners and other employees working therein shall have been hoisted out of said mine.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Wherever it is practicable to do so the entries, rooms, and all openings being operated in coal mines shall be kept well dampened with water to cause the coal dust to settle, and that when water is not obtainable at reasonable cost for this purpose accumulations of dust shall be taken out of the mine, and shall not be deposited in way places in the mine where it would be again distributed in the atmosphere by the ventilating currents.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act entitled "An act for the protection of the lives of miners in the Territories" be amended by striking out "3,300" and inserting "5,000," so as to read:

"SEC. 6. That the owners or managers of every coal mine at a depth of 100 feet or more shall provide an adequate amount of ventilation of not less than 834 cubic feet of pure air per second, or 5,000 cubic feet per minute for every 50 men at work in said mine, and in like proportion for a greater number, which air shall by proper appliances or machinery be forced through such mine to the face of each and every working place, so as to dilute and render harmless and expel therefrom the noxious or poisonous gases. Wherever it is practicable to do so the entries, rooms, and all openings being operated in coal mines shall be kept well dampened with water to cause the coal dust to settle, and that when water is not obtainable at reasonable cost for this purpose accumulations of dust shall be taken out of the mine, and shall not be deposited in way places in the mine where it would be again distributed in the atmosphere by the ventilating currents. The violation of this act shall constitute a misdemeanor, and any person convicted of such violation shall pay a fine of not exceeding \$500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

MOUNT RAINIER NATIONAL PARK.

The bill (S. 255) for the improvement of the Mount Rainier National Park, in the State of Washington, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It appropriates \$25,000, to be expended under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, for the purpose of improving the Mount Rainier National Park, in the State of Washington, and for the protection of the park and the construction and repair of bridges, fences, and trails, and improvement and construction of roads.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT J. SPOTTSWOOD AND OTHERS.

The bill (H. R. 7018) for the relief of Robert J. Spottswood and the heirs of William C. McClellan, deceased, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PATTERSON. I ask that that bill may be passed over without prejudice, retaining its place on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That order will be made, in the absence of objection.

MRS. ARIVELLA D. MEEKER.

The bill (S. 1305) for the relief of Mrs. Arivella D. Meeker was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported by the Committee on Claims with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to pay to Mrs. Arivella D. Meeker, of Greeley, Colo., the sum of \$9,012.83, as a recognition of the services of her husband, the late Nathan Cook Meeker, as Indian agent at the White River Agency, in Colorado, and for the losses his family sustained by reason of his assassination and the destruction of his property by the Indians of said agency in the year 1879.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I notice that the report suggests that this money ought to be paid out of the annuities of the Confederate Bands of Ute Indians, and it was so provided in the original bill; but it is not in the amendment of the committee. I think it must have been omitted by oversight. I move to amend in line 14, on page 2, after the word "cents," by inserting

"out of the annuities of the Confederated Bands of the Ute Indians."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### ACCOUNTS OF LAND OFFICES IN KANSAS.

The joint resolution (S. R. 71) directing the Secretary of the Interior to restate the accounts of certain registers and receivers of the United States land offices in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes, was considered in Committee of the Whole. It directs the Secretary of the Interior to restate the accounts of the registers and receivers of the United States land offices in the State of Kansas upon whom were imposed the duties and responsibilities of making sale and disposal of the Osage ceded, Osage trust, and Osage diminished reserve lands, in that State, under the treaty of September 29, 1865, between the United States and the Osage Indians, and the acts of Congress for carrying the treaty into effect, and to allow to each of the said registers and receivers for their service 1 per cent as commission on the proceeds arising from the sale and disposal of the lands received during their periods of service, respectively, less such amount heretofore received by them as commission on the proceeds, the sums so ascertained, to be stated separately as to each of the classes of lands, to be reported to Congress.

Mr. SPOONER. Let that joint resolution go over.

Mr. HARRIS. I hope the joint resolution may be considered. It was originally in the form of an amendment, which was offered to an appropriation bill, and was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs. In order to arrive at an exact understanding of the amounts supposed to be due, the committee authorized me to report a joint resolution recasting the accounts to be so stated, in order to get at the amounts claimed by the various parties.

Mr. SPOONER. I withdraw the objection.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### FRANCES GURLEY ELDERKIN.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3743) granting an increase of pension to Frances Gurley Elderkin; which was, in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "forty" and insert "thirty-five."

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate agree to the amendment made by the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

#### EDWARD THOMPSON.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2976) granting an increase of pension to Edward Thompson; which was, in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-four" and insert "twenty."

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

#### ANDREW J. FELT.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2371) granting a pension to Andrew J. Felt; which was, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-four" and insert "thirty."

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment made by the House of Representatives and ask for a conference with the House on the bill and amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. DEBOE, and Mr. TURNER were appointed.

#### IMITATION DAIRY PRODUCTS.

Mr. PROCTOR. I move that House bill 9206 be now taken up.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9206) to make oleomargarine and other imitation dairy products subject to the laws of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia into which they are transported, and to change the tax on oleomargarine, and to amend an act entitled "An act defining butter, also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine," approved August 2, 1886.

Mr. PATTERSON. I present a petition to the Senate from the Cattle and Horse Growers' Association of Colorado, which represents 32 local live-stock associations, and as it relates to the bill now under discussion I ask that it be read.

There being no objection, the petition was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

#### MEMORIAL TO THE SENATE OF THE FIFTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

We, your memorialists, the Cattle and Horse Growers' Association of Colorado, beg to represent that we are an organization composed of nearly all of the local live-stock associations of the State and representing practically the entire live-stock industry of Colorado. The principal business of the members of this association is that of breeding, feeding, and marketing beef cattle.

There is now pending in the Senate of the United States a bill known as House bill No. 9206, which has already passed the House of Representatives, providing for a tax of 10 cents per pound on colored oleomargarine. We, your petitioners, desire to respectfully enter our protest against the passage of this bill into a law, believing that such legislation is against the interests of not only growers of beef cattle, sheep, and hogs in this State, but also against the interests of the farmers and dairymen, the latter class being led to believe that the passage of this bill will increase the price they will receive for butter; but we, your petitioners, are convinced that such would not be the result, and that the chief class to profit by such a measure would be the owners and operators of big creameries.

We would respectfully call the attention of your honorable body to the fact that oleomargarine is largely used upon the stock ranches of the western country, principally for the reason that it is a pure and wholesome article of diet and a good substitute for butter, which in many places is impossible to be had. It is also used largely in the mining and other labor districts of the nation and in localities where it is impossible to get fresh butter, and owing to its purity and keeping qualities oleomargarine is very much preferred as an article of diet.

The consumers of the product in the West prefer to have it colored yellow, as was the practice in Holland before the creamery manufacturers assumed to themselves this exclusive right, not with any intent to deceive themselves or others, but simply and solely because the color is more pleasing to the eye, and consequently makes the product more palatable.

Should this bill become a law it will not interfere with the consumption of this product in this State, as a majority of the consumers would pay as much for the oleomargarine as for butter, preferring the former product at the same price; consequently this tax of 10 cents per pound would have to come from the pockets of the consumers, who number thousands for every creamery or oleomargarine factory in the country.

We would also call the attention of the Senate to the fact that oleomargarine is largely composed of the product of beef and dairy cattle, which we raise, the percentage being oleo oil (from the beef) 28.83, milk, butter, and cream 25.89 per cent, and should the proposed law diminish the consumption of oleomargarine in other parts of the country, it would result in a decreased use of these products from our beef and dairy cattle, and a consequent decrease in the value of the same.

It is the opinion of your memorialists that the confessed object of this bill—to prevent the use and consumption of oleomargarine as an article of food, to curtail its manufacture, and, if possible, to suppress its use altogether—would not be attained by the proposed law. As the laws and regulations already governing the manufacture of this article are sufficiently severe on those who attempt to sell it as butter, the increased price incident to the proposed law would be simply offering a premium to the men who are braving the present laws, and would result in an increased use of this imitation of butter under the name of butter.

We, your memorialists, are in favor of any reasonable law which will compel the manufacturers of this article of diet to sell the same as oleomargarine, but we are of the firm belief that the proposed bill would be most vicious legislation and is more calculated to injure the dairy business than, as alleged by the creamery combine, to grant the dairymen and farmers a relief from the competition of oleomargarine.

We are heartily in favor of the so-called Wadsworth bill, which provides that this product should be manufactured only in 1 and 2 pound packages, each package to be carefully labeled and stamped. As a large number of your memorialists are users of this product and prefer it to butter for the reasons above given, they naturally desire to know that they are securing oleomargarine rather than renovated butter, which is unhealthy and becomes rancid soon after being taken to the ranches, and naturally would favor any fair law which will enable us to know that we are securing just what we pay for.

Therefore we most earnestly protest against the said bill now pending before your honorable body, and most respectfully urge that it be not enacted into law.

And for this your petitioners will ever pray.

Arickaree Valley Stock Growers' Association; Axial Basin Stock Growers' Association; Bent County Cattle and Horse Growers' Association; Boulder County Stock Growers' Association; Chaffee County Stock Growers' Association; Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, Roundup District No. 9; Douglas County Stock Growers' Association; Edward Stock Growers' Association; Egeria Park Stock Growers' Association; Eagle Stock Growers' Association; Elk River Stock Growers' Association; Fremont County Stock Growers' Association; Fort Collins Sheep Feeders' Association; Grand River Stock Growers' Association; Gunnison County Stock Growers' Association; Hayden Stock Growers' Association; Kit Carson County Live Stock Association; Larimer County Stock Growers' Association; Lincoln County Cattle Growers' Association; Montrose Cattle and Horse Growers' Association; Middle Park Stock Growers' Association; Montezuma County Stock Growers' Association; North Park Stock Growers' Association; Otero County Stock Association; Park County Cattle Growers' Association; Roaring Fork and Eagle River Stock Growers' Association; Routt County Range Protective Association; Saguache Stock Growers' Association; Steamboat Springs Cattle Growers' Association; Southern Colorado Cattle and Horse Growers' Association; San Luis Valley Cattle and Horse Growers' Association; Yuma and Eastern Arapahoe County Cattle and Horse Growers' Association.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the controversy between butter and oleomargarine is one of long standing. The issue raised by this controversy has been so fully discussed in both branches of Congress and before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate that the arguments and facts for and against this legislation are generally familiar to the Senate. I can not say, and I do not hope to say, anything new upon this subject, but it is probable that the people are not so familiar with these facts and these arguments as are Senators, and while primarily the object of discussion here is to enlighten the Senate, it is also important and useful in informing and instructing the people.

I am opposed to the pending bill, because, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I have been present at most of the hearings during this session, and I have read most of the evidence at hearings at other times and in the other House of Congress, and they satisfy my mind, at least, that oleomargarine is not only a healthful but a nutritious article of diet, and that the coloring matter which is placed in it is not injurious, but adds greatly to its market value and acceptability to the consumer, as does the same coloring matter in the case of white butter when it is placed in that article, and because, being a healthy and nutritious article of diet, in my judgment, the manufacturers of oleomargarine have a right, which ought not to be denied to them, and which can not be legally and constitutionally denied to them, to use in the manufacture of their product any article which is not deleterious to the health of the consumer.

Mr. President, I do not believe the charges that are so persistently made by the advocates of this measure, that to any considerable extent the materials used in the manufacture of oleomargarine are improper or injurious. I do not believe these charges, because the evidence which has been adduced before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in the hearings to which I have referred contains nothing to support them, but contains much to refute them; and I do not believe them, because there is easy at hand to every manufacturer of oleomargarine the greatest abundance of pure materials to be had at such low prices as to preclude the temptation to practice this fraud upon the public.

I have no doubt that in the beginning of this industry in this country there were many questionable experimentations and even rascalities in the selection and use of materials that enter into oleomargarine by the manufacturer; but in 1886 Congress passed an act placing all these factories under the control and supervision of the Government, and since that time I do not believe that there have been any abuses worth mentioning practiced in connection with the manufacture of that article. So far as the manufacturers of oleomargarine are concerned, since these inspection laws went into force, I am satisfied that both in the selection of the materials which they use and in the processes which they employ in its manufacture there is no manufactured food product in this country, not excepting butter, which is produced with greater purity and cleanliness than oleomargarine is sent out from the factories.

I am satisfied, and I think the opponents of this bill are satisfied, that there is now, and has been all along, more or less fraud practiced by the retailers of oleomargarine in representing and selling their product for butter for the purpose of securing the higher profit allowed by butter prices. I am satisfied that is so; and is so to such an extent that it calls for action by Congress, because the evidence tends to show that this class of fraud is practiced more or less wherever oleomargarine is sold. I am satisfied it is so for other reasons, chief among them the fact that the present law regulating the sale of oleomargarine, which permits the manufacturer to put it up in packages of 10 pounds and sell it to the retailer, offers to these retailers easy opportunities to commit fraud of this character with comparative safety on their part.

Some of the oleomargarine retail dealers, like the retail dealers in other lines of commerce, are rascals; some of them are unscrupulous; some of them take advantage of the opportunities afforded them by the present inefficient law to make a fraudulent profit in the conduct of their business.

Mr. President, because we are satisfied that these frauds are practiced on the part of retail dealers, and to such an extent as would call for further legislation on this subject by Congress, the opponents of this measure are perfectly willing to vote and stand ready to vote for any measure the sole object of which is to suppress and prevent these frauds; but we are not willing to vote for a measure based upon the absurd theory that in order to prevent fraud in the sale of this article it is necessary to prevent its sale altogether. Nor do we propose to vote for a measure which, under the pretext of suppressing fraud in the sale of an article, seeks to outlaw that article and drive it out of the market altogether.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. QUARLES], in his very able speech delivered in this Chamber last week, in an impassioned denunciation of oleomargarine, exclaimed, "We are dealing with a question of fraud;" and so we are dealing with a question of fraud and a fraud that ought to be punished and ought to be suppressed. But I want to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that it is not the custom in this country, at least, to punish fraud by killing the rascally perpetrator of the fraud, and it is not the custom in this country, at least, to seek to suppress fraud in the sale of an article by ostracizing that article and banishing it from the markets.

The opponents of this bill stand ready to vote for the most drastic measure having for its object the suppression of the frauds complained of, and which it is admitted to some extent exist, and on this behalf the minority of the committee have pre-

sented a substitute which it is believed will effectually accomplish this purpose.

Now, Mr. President, let me analyze this substitute and compare it with other admittedly effectual legislation against similar frauds. First, it places every factory where oleomargarine is manufactured under the closest Government inspection and espionage. Second, it requires every pound of oleomargarine to be put up in packages of 1 and 2 pounds and in no other or larger or smaller packages. Third, the article itself is to be impressed in sunken letters with the word "oleomargarine." Thus impressed, it is to be wrapped in a paper wrapper with the word "oleomargarine" printed thereon in distinct letters, together with the name of the manufacturer, and the article thus impressed and wrapped is to be placed in wooden or paper packages, upon which shall be branded the word "oleomargarine," and the whole is to be circled with a Government oleomargarine stamp. Fourth, no oleomargarine is permitted to be sold by manufacturer or retailer except in unbroken packages of 1 or 2 pounds. Fifth, the product, both in the hands of the retail dealer and the manufacturer, is constantly under the espionage of the Government, and the slightest infraction in any of these and other regulations provided in the substitute will subject the violator to heavy fines and penalties.

Can there be any reasonable doubts that the provisions of this substitute, if enacted into a law, would effectually put an end to the frauds and deceits complained of? I do not believe there is, and I doubt whether there are many who do honestly believe there is any such doubt.

A partial answer to this question will be found in the effect of a similar act to prevent the fraudulent sale of what is known as filled cheese for dairy cheese. A few years ago the manufacturers of dairy cheese raised a great clamor on account of the alleged fraudulent sale of this imitation product as cheese. Congress was asked to interfere to put an end to this alleged counterfeit and fraud, just as the dairymen are now asking it to protect butter. In response to their demand Congress passed an act defining dairy cheese and filled cheese, and differentiating the two and making certain regulations for the sale of filled cheese, so as to put a stop to these frauds. For the purpose of showing the character of this legislation I wish to read section 6 of the act:

SEC. 6. That filled cheese shall be packed by the manufacturers in wooden packages only, not before used for that purpose, and marked, stamped, and branded with the words "filled cheese" in black-faced letters not less than 2 inches in length, in a circle in the center of the top and bottom of the cheese; and in black-faced letters of not less than 2 inches in length in line from the top to the bottom of the cheese, on the side in four places equidistant from each other; and the package containing such cheese shall be marked in the same manner, and in the same number of places, and in the same description of letters as above provided for the marking of the cheese; and all sales or consignments made by manufacturers of filled cheese to wholesale dealers in filled cheese or to exporters of filled cheese shall be in original stamped packages.

Retail dealers in filled cheese shall sell only from original stamped packages, and shall pack the filled cheese when sold in suitable wooden or paper packages, which shall be marked and branded in accordance with rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Every person who knowingly sells or offers to sell, or delivers or offers to deliver filled cheese in any other form than in new wooden or paper packages, marked and branded as hereinbefore provided, and as above described, or who packs in any package or packages filled cheese in any manner contrary to law, or who falsely brands any package or affixes a stamp on any package denoting a less amount of tax than that required by law, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined for each and every offense not less than \$50 and not more than \$500, or be imprisoned not less than thirty days nor more than one year.

Under that act filled cheese is placed under governmental supervision and the manufacturer is required to stamp and brand every package of filled cheese and the retailer is permitted to sell it only out of these branded packages. Before the passage of this law there was a great deal of trouble on account of fraudulent sales of filled cheese as dairy cheese, not only at home but especially in foreign markets, and our consular representatives abroad were constantly representing to the Government that this imitation and fraudulent product was undermining our cheese market abroad.

Since the passage of that act the evidence taken before the committee shows that these complaints, both at home and abroad, have totally ceased, and there is no suggestion to-day from any source that filled cheese is being sold to any considerable extent in imitation of dairy cheese.

It is the duty of the Treasury Department to enforce all laws and regulations to prevent frauds against the revenues of the Government. The Secretary of the Treasury is supposed, by reason of his experience in the enforcement of these laws, to be especially informed as to their sufficiency to accomplish the object of their enactment.

Now, when this bill and the pending substitute was before the Fifty-sixth Congress, the question of the adequacy of this substitute to suppress the frauds complained of was raised before the committee having the bill under investigation, and the then Secretary of the Treasury, the Hon. Lyman J. Gage, was examined as a witness upon these points. The evidence he then gave is a complete answer to all of the arguments of the advocates of this

bill, to the effect that the only remedy for this fraud is in practically denying the manufacturers of oleomargarine the right to color their products. Let me read the evidence of Secretary Gage before the committee.

Mr. SPRINGER—

Mr. Springer appeared before the committee, I believe, as the attorney of the Live Stock Association, and as such was permitted to participate in the hearing by asking questions of witnesses.

Mr. SPRINGER. The difficulties which have been called to the attention of the committee in regard to the selling of oleomargarine or butterine seem to relate to the fact that the retail dealer may break the original package and deal it out in smaller quantities to suit the desires of the purchaser, and in so doing he can sell oleomargarine or butterine to a consumer who presumes that he is buying butter.

Now, I desire to ask you whether it would be possible to make such rules and regulations (if the law so authorizes) requiring the selling of oleomargarine to the consumer by the agents of the manufacturer or the retail dealer in the original package, without breaking even the stamp itself around the original package, that the selling of oleomargarine for butter would be prevented, and it would have to be sold for what it really is?

Secretary GAGE. I think so. I have read the amendment or substitute bill recommended by the minority report of the House committee.

That is the same that the minority of the committee now present.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN. That is what is known as the Wadsworth bill?

Secretary GAGE. It provides a method of putting up oleomargarine in packages of 1 pound or not more than 2 pounds, I believe. Am I right?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, sir; that is right.

Secretary GAGE. They are, as I understand, required to be separate and distinct from each other, with a revenue stamp wound around them and sealed as effectively as a box of cigars is with its stamp. I can not imagine any reason why that would not be a very effective means of preventing the dealer from opening these packages and selling the product as butter. The abuse in that respect would be reduced to an infinitesimal amount. Of course, a dealer could cut a package in two, obliterate the stamp, and sell half a pound at a time as butter.

Senator MONEY. That is possible with cigars and everything else, is it not?

Secretary GAGE. It is possible in every department, but the temptation would be so small, and the penalties so great, that my opinion is that such deception would scarcely be practiced at all.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is to say, if the dealer is required to sell it to the consumer in the original packages and is not allowed to break them?

Secretary GAGE. That is what I mean.

Mr. SPRINGER. It would almost do away with the possibility of fraud on the consumer?

Secretary GAGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. President, in view of this evidence of the Secretary, in view of the effect of the filled-cheese act, I want to ask why are not the advocates of this bill, if their sole purpose is to suppress fraud, and if it is no part of their purpose, as is charged, to suppress competition and to destroy another industry, willing to accept the substitute? It certainly is no answer to say that the present law has not been effective. Of course it has not. It does not require Secretary Gage or even a lawyer to see that the present law is wide open to the frauds which are admitted to exist and which we all want to suppress. What does their refusal to accept the substitute as a settlement of this matter signify? What does it mean? To my mind it can mean but one thing. It means what is apparent from the bill itself and what was disclosed by the hearings before the committee and what is shown in the hysterical appeals that have been made in this debate on behalf of the cow. It shows that their purpose is not to suppress fraud; it is not to prevent fraud in the sale of this article so much as it is to protect the cow and her products and to suppress a competitor.

Mr. President, so far as oleomargarine is concerned, it is not a direct competitor of high-class dairy butter, although it is an indirect competitor of that article. It is not a direct competitor, because the difference in price removes it from the field of competition. High-class dairy butter at its present price sells in the market at from 30 to 40 cents a pound net. Even when you add the 10-cent tax proposed by this bill to the present price of oleomargarine it will still sell upon the market, when sold upon its merits, as I think it generally is, though sometimes it is not, at from 10 to 16 cents less than high-class dairy butter. But while oleomargarine is not a direct competitor of high-class dairy butter, it is a direct competitor of what is known as renovated butter and an indirect competitor of high-class butter.

I know, Mr. President, that it is claimed that dealers in high-class dairy butter have no interest in renovated or process butter, and that they are willing to let it stand upon its own merits and fight its own battles. But it is perfectly obvious that this is not true, and that they are interested and deeply interested in renovated butter. Why? Because they are interested in anything that preserves and prolongs the life of their product, and renovated butter is a dairy product, though a degenerated dairy product. The prolongation of the life of their product is an important element in the value of their product. That is exactly what the process factories do. They reclaim and rereclaim and reclaim again dairy butter from rancidity and from death, and by chemical process impart to it a sort of perennial youth and freshness, and in this way these process factories become a potent element in the market value of the whole dairy product.

The object of the bill is, therefore, not to protect dairy butter against the direct competition of oleomargarine, but it is to de-

stroy competition between oleomargarine and what is known as process or renovated butter, and by driving it from the market altogether make a full demand and high-price market both for the fresh product and this degenerate product of the dairy. Those who are denouncing oleomargarine as a vile counterfeit have found nothing to condemn in renovated butter and its fraudulent sale as a pure, fresh product of the dairy. Of course, the widespread sale of this chemically manipulated concoction is a fraud, and they know it is a fraud; but it is a fraud against the people and not against the cow. It is said there are those who think a dollar is more sacred than a man, and I am afraid there are also those who, in their zeal for the dairy, think a cow is more entitled to protection against fraud than the people.

I was glad that the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. HARRIS] during the past week presented an amendment to the pending bill having for its purpose putting renovated butter under the same strict governmental supervision and control that this bill proposes to place around and upon oleomargarine. I trust the Senator will press that amendment, and I hope he will force a ye-a-and-may vote upon it. In that event I shall watch with profound interest the votes of the friends of this bill. I predict now that they will not vote for this amendment. And why? Because the same interest that is behind this bill, the same interest that has hounded oleomargarine from the day it was born as an industry in this country, the same interest that has excited all of the public prejudice and the hostile State legislation enacted against this product—I mean the dairy interest—is interested to see that renovated butter is not fettered and restricted as it demands oleomargarine shall be.

Now, Mr. President, what is process butter or renovated butter? I am not going to trouble the Senate by reading from the evidence to any considerable extent upon this subject, but I do desire to read what Professor Alvord has to say. I believe he is at the head of the Dairy Bureau of the Agricultural Department, and I believe he is not only famous as an expert in dairy products in this country but that he is also known throughout the world as such. Here is a letter written by him February 8, 1900, in which, in describing what process butter is, he says:

FEBRUARY 8, 1900.

DEAR SIR: Your inquiry has been received relating to process or renovated butter.

We have nothing printed upon this subject, and it would be impossible to give you a full account of it within the limits of a letter.

Briefly, it is butter which has become unmerchantable, or what we would call bad butter, running through all the degrees of badness, bought up cheaply, brought together in large quantity, reduced to a limpid oil by melting, and clarified by both chemical and mechanical processes, which are more or less secret. The oil is then drawn off, a semblance of the crystallization or granulation of butter fat is obtained by chilling, usually by spraying the fat into ice water, and then it is re churned with more or less sour milk or buttermilk to give it the new flavor, salted, and made up for market.

It is in this form just what the name "renovated" implies. Unless adulterated with other fats, which is not usual, it can be claimed to be pure butter, as far as chemical composition is concerned. But many of the characteristics of good and fresh butter are lacking, and the renovated article deteriorates very rapidly unless it is kept quite cold.

The chief objection to this renovated butter is that it is sold in large quantities under misrepresentation in place of fresh creamery butter—

The gravamen of the charge against oleomargarine—

and at prices much above its actual value. Fraud upon purchasers and consumers is thus perpetrated, and this is the feature connected with the business which needs governmental interference and regulation.

Very respectfully, yours,

HENRY E. ALVORD.

Dr. J. J. BAUMANN,

661 Jersey Avenue, Jersey City, N. J.

Now, in brief, Mr. President, renovated butter is old, rancid, unmarketable butter, gathered up from the four quarters of the country—from the hotels, and the restaurants, and the boarding houses, and the country stores—and sent to these process factories; there it meets the product of the cow of the treeless prairies of the West, and of the rocky hills of New England, and of the wire-grass region of the South in sympathetic and friendly embrace; there, with the aid of acids and adroit chemical surgery, the seeds of disease and death with which it has become infected are removed, and thus restored to apparent health, it is sent out as healthy butter, looking like healthy butter, with the sweet odor and with the exquisite flavor of perfectly well butter, and in that guise it is sold and bought and consumed.

But, Mr. President, this restoration to health is only temporary. This newfound freshness is short lived, and unless it is speedily bought and consumed it soon has a relapse to its old condition of rancidity. But there is one consolation about this patient. However often it may have a relapse, and however severe the disease may be, there is always a sure restorative and an unfailing panacea to be found in the numerous butter hospitals scattered about in this country, created and existing for the sole and exclusive purpose of treating and curing the disease to which creamery butter is unfortunately a victim.

Mr. President, we hear a great deal about the anticolor laws of the States against oleomargarine. Gentlemen have fallen back

upon those laws as an excuse for their effort through this bill to strike down the oleomargarine industry. I want to remind gentlemen who rely upon those laws as a justification for this legislation that there are also State laws in this country against renovated and process butter. I do not know how many States have laws of that kind; I believe about ten or twelve. I appeal to the gentlemen who place their support of this bill upon the fact that certain States have ostracised oleomargarine when they go to vote upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas they that give the same consideration and significance to the State laws against renovated butter as to those against oleomargarine, and when they vote to protect the cow against oleomargarine that they will at the same time vote for the amendment of the Senator from Kansas to protect the people against renovated butter.

Mr. President, about the only argument I have heard in favor of this legislation, except the fraud argument to which I have so far chiefly devoted myself, is the fact that many of the States have enacted laws against the sale of oleomargarine. It is said by the friends of this bill that those laws show such a general antipathy on the part of the people against this product that it furnishes them a sufficient justification for this legislation.

I frankly admit that those laws apparently indicate (and I say apparently advisedly) a very harsh sentiment on the part of the people of those States toward oleomargarine. But when we analyze the reasons and considerations which led to the enactment of those laws, we will see, as I said, that it is more an apparent antipathy and objection than a real one. Most of those laws were passed under the influence of a misunderstanding created by the agitation and the exaggeration and the falsehoods instigated and put in circulation by the dairy interest as to the materials which enter into the manufacture of this product.

At the time they were passed there was a general misunderstanding in the country as to the character of the ingredients of the article. It was generally supposed that the article was made up of loathsome and repulsive ingredients, repugnant to the taste, and poisonous to the human system. This was the impression not only in those States at that time, but it was the impression among the enlightened members of this body and of the House when that measure was first discussed and debated in Congress. The only argument made in favor of the law was the argument that oleomargarine was unhealthy and poisonous to the human system. The fraud argument that we now hear was not made then at all.

Now, time has removed from the field of disputation and discussion the fundamental fact upon which this discriminating legislation of the States was based. When we consider whether State laws or national laws are wise or unwise and whether they indicate a certain public sentiment or feeling, we must look to the reasons which inspired the enactment of those laws. If there was a mistake as to facts, as to the grounds upon which the enactment was made, the reason for it failing, we may expect sooner or later that it will be repealed.

Now, Mr. President, the only ground upon which this State legislation was originally based has been removed and no longer exists, but the advocates of the bill say if that be so, why then have not those laws been repealed by the States? They have not been repealed because another reason for their continuance on the statute books has intervened and furnishes a justification for their continuance, and that is the reason I have just given why we should pass the minority substitute. I mean the necessity of regulating its sale so as to prevent deceits in selling it for what it is not. Remove this reason, as the other has been removed, by the National Government taking hold of this question and placing around the article a strict supervision to prevent the class of fraud to protect themselves against which the States still keep these prohibitory acts upon their statute books, and I predict that the States will be satisfied and that speedily and rapidly every one of the anticolor laws against oleomargarine will be repealed.

Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate in discussing the proposition that time and experience and science have proved that the original basis of this legislation has been removed, for it is now almost universally admitted that at the time of the passage of these prohibitory laws the character of oleomargarine and its effect upon the human system were altogether misunderstood, and that it is not only not an unhealthy article, but it is an exceedingly healthy and nutritious food product. One of the chief advocates of this bill in debate in the other branch of Congress a few days ago admitted this fact, and the evidence taken before the committees of the two Houses during the last and the present session (evidence of the best scientific experts in the country) proves conclusively that the arguments which prevailed in securing the passage of these laws were based upon falsehood and misunderstanding as to the ingredients and qualities of this article.

I wish to read some of the evidence upon this point. It is so

conclusive, so overwhelming, it has practically silenced this clamor and forced the advocates of this legislation to put their support of it upon entirely new grounds. I read from the report of the Committee on Manufactures of the Senate appointed during the Fifty-sixth Congress. A part of the report which I read will be found printed on pages 57 and 59 of the committee's report, which is as follows:

In regard to butterine or oleomargarine it is not claimed by any of the witnesses before your committee that it is in any way deleterious to public health. On the contrary, all expert evidence upon this point strongly confirms the testimony of the manufacturers of this article, to the effect that it is a healthful food product. The testimony shows that this product is the result of a combination of beef and pork fats, butter, cream, and milk with coloring matter, which is similar to that universally used by farmers and dairies engaged in the manufacture of butter for the coloring of that product. As under the resolution under which this committee is operating it is made one of its duties to investigate food products and to ascertain what is sold that is deleterious to the public health, your committee made every effort to obtain information upon this branch of the subject, and in addition to oral testimony there were submitted authorities of an expert character, as follows:

Henry Morton, Stevens Institute Technology, New Jersey: "It contains nothing whatever which is injurious as an article of diet; but, on the contrary, is essentially identical with the best fresh butter."

S. C. Caldwell, chemical laboratory, Cornell University: "Possesses no qualities whatever that can make it in the least degree unwholesome."

Charles P. Williams, analytical chemist, Philadelphia: "It is a pure and wholesome article of food, and in this respect, as in respect to its chemical composition, is fully the equivalent of the best dairy butter."

Henry A. Mott, analytical chemist, New York: "Essentially identical with butter made from cream, and a perfectly pure and wholesome article."

W. O. Atwater, Wesleyan University, Connecticut: "It is perfectly wholesome and healthy, and has a high and nutritious value."

Scientific American: "Oleomargarine is as much a farm product as beef or butter, and is as wholesome as either."

Prof. Charles F. Chandler, New York City: "The product is palatable and wholesome, and I regard it as a most valuable article of food."

Prof. George F. Barker, University of Pennsylvania: "It is perfectly wholesome, and is desirable as an article of food."

I will also read a few opinions of leading scientists, which I find on pages 4 and 5 of Senate Document 2043:

#### OPINIONS OF LEADING SCIENTISTS.

Prof. C. F. Chandler, professor of chemistry at Columbia College, New York, says: "I have studied the question of its use as food, in comparison with the ordinary butter made from cream, and have satisfied myself that it is quite as valuable as the butter from the cow. The product is palatable and wholesome, and I regard it as a most valuable article of food."

Prof. George F. Barker, of the University of Pennsylvania, says: "Butterine is, in my opinion, quite as valuable as a nutritive agent as butter itself. It is perfectly wholesome, and is desirable as an article of food. I can see no reason why butterine should not be an entirely satisfactory equivalent for ordinary butter, whether considered from the physiological or commercial standpoint."

Prof. S. W. Johnson, director of the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station, and professor of agricultural chemistry in Yale College, New Haven, says: "It is a product that is entirely attractive and wholesome as food, and one that is, for all ordinary and culinary purposes, the full equivalent of good butter made from cream. I regard the manufacture of oleomargarine as a legitimate and beneficial industry."

Prof. C. A. Goessmann, of Amherst Agricultural College, says: "Oleomargarine butter compares in general appearance and in taste very favorably with the average quality of the better kinds of dairy butter in our markets. In its composition it resembles that of ordinary dairy butter, and in its keeping quality, under corresponding circumstances, I believe it will surpass the former, for it contains a smaller percentage of those constituents which, in the main, cause the well-known rancid taste and odor of a stored butter."

Prof. J. W. S. Arnold, professor of physiology in the University of New York, says: "I consider that each and every article employed in the manufacture of oleomargarine butter is perfectly pure and wholesome; that oleomargarine butter differs in no essential manner from butter made from cream. In fact oleomargarine butter possesses the advantage over natural butter of not decomposing so readily, as it contains fewer volatile fats. In my opinion oleomargarine is to be considered a great discovery, a blessing for the poor, and in every way a perfectly pure, wholesome, and palatable article of food."

Prof. Paul Schweitzer, Ph. D., LL. D., professor of chemistry, Missouri State University, says: "As a result of my examination, made both with the microscope and the delicate chemical tests applicable to such cases, I pronounce butterine to be wholly and unequivocally free from any deleterious or in the least objectionable substances. Carefully made physiological experiments reveal no difference whatever in the palatability and digestibility between butterine and butter."

Now, Mr. President, if this bill passes the effect will be not only to prevent the manufacture and sale of colored oleomargarine, but to cripple the whole oleomargarine industry in this country. There are two reasons why it will destroy the manufacture of colored oleomargarine: First, because colored oleomargarine is now sold for only 3 or 4 cents more than the cost of production, and when you add to this the 10 cents tax proposed by this bill it will, on account of the price, be unsalable. Secondly, if this bill passes this first section would make effectual the anticolor laws of the several States, which are now ineffectual and largely inoperative because of the decision of the Supreme Court in the original package case and in the Schollerberger case. The sole object of the first section of this bill is, by breathing life into these laws, to make oleomargarine a contraband of commerce, to take from it its character as a commercial product and deny it the protection of the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution, which the Supreme Court decided it is entitled to enjoy, and place it in the category of spirituous liquors.

The effect would be to take from colored oleomargarine 60,000,000 of its possible purchasers and consumers who live in the States in which these laws have been passed. Its passage may not

stop the manufacture of uncolored oleomargarine, but it will handicap it to such an extent as to make its profitable manufacture extremely doubtful, because it is well known, on account of the taste and fancy of the consumer (the same taste and fancy which dictates to the producer of white butter coloring matter to make it more palatable and pleasing), that there is practically no demand, or at least such a limited demand, for the uncolored article as butter as to make its manufacture for that purpose unprofitable, and the other demands for white oleomargarine are so limited that it is extremely doubtful whether its use would be sufficiently large to remunerate the large amount of capital invested in this industry.

Mr. President, in addition to the destruction of the oleomargarine industry and the millions of dollars worth of property invested in that industry, let us inquire what other important and legitimate occupations and industries will be affected by this legislation. Now, it is said that butter is a product of the farm; that the cow stands at the threshold of all agricultural prosperity, and that both she and her product should be protected. I do not deny the great value of the dairy cow. The dairy interest is one which should be encouraged, and the use of the cow in the home and upon the farm can not be overestimated. Both she and her product are entitled to all legitimate encouragement and protection.

But oleomargarine is also a farm product and an honest and legitimate industry. Practically everything that enters into it is made upon the farm—milk, cream, butter, cotton-seed oil, neutral lard, and oleo oil, all of them farm products, and at least 40 per cent of them the product of the cow herself. Chemically it is the same as butter. It has every chemical ingredient that butter has and none other. Now, the people who furnish the larger part of the ingredients that enter into oleomargarine are the cotton-seed oil manufacturers and the growers of beef cattle and hogs. These people believe, and honestly believe, that this legislation will affect them injuriously, and they are here protesting against its passage. They have sent representatives here; they have sent petitions here; they have sent resolutions here. I have here the resolutions passed by the cotton-seed oil superintendents of North and South Carolina, at a meeting held in July, 1900, at Charleston, S. C. I will read them, for they show the opinion of these skilled managers of this great Southern industry as to the effect of this legislation upon their business and through them upon the grower of cotton seed.

#### SUPERINTENDENTS OF OIL MILLS IN NORTH AND SOUTH CAROLINA.

Resolutions against oleomargarine tax offered at meeting of cotton-oil mill superintendents:

"CHARLESTON, S. C., July 6.

"Cotton-oil superintendents from South Carolina and North Carolina met yesterday at the Calhoun Hotel for the purpose of organizing the cotton-oil mill superintendents' association.

"After the constitution and by-laws were read and adopted, the following resolutions were offered by A. A. Haynes:

"*Resolved*, That this association, representing millions of dollars of invested capital in the South, strongly protests against national class legislation which aims directly at the destruction of competition in the manufacture and sale of wholesome and healthful articles of food.

"*Resolved*, That we protest strenuously against the passage by Congress of the Groul oleomargarine bill, which proposes to tax oleomargarine 10 cents per pound, and thus to drive it from the market.

"*Resolved*, That this association implores Congress not to destroy an industry which now uses nearly 10,000,000 pounds of the best grade of cotton-seed oil annually, and thus kill that quantity of our most profitable output.

"*Resolved*, That we urge the legislatures of South Carolina and of other Southern States to remove from their statute books the antioleomargarine legislation thereon, because such acts are only in the interest of the renovated and process butter factories of the North and Northwest, and against the hog fats, beef fats, and cotton-seed oil products grown on our Southern farms.

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the National Provisioner, of New York and Chicago, the indomitable champion of the cotton-oil interests, for publication, and that the members of this association proceed to secure, if possible, the repeal of the obnoxious State laws above referred to.

"*Resolved*, That this association will do what it can to cause the defeat of the Groul antioleomargarine bill in Congress during the coming session."

Among the cotton-seed oil manufacturers who appeared before the committee of the Senate during the Fiftieth Congress against this bill was Mr. D. A. Tompkins, of my State. I know Mr. Tompkins well. He is largely interested not only in cotton-seed oil mills, but in various lines of manufacturing. He is one of the most prominent and useful men in the whole South, a leader in its industrial development, a man of broad information, accurate knowledge, and absolutely reliable in his statements. In the speech made by him before the committee he stated:

I say that if they pass this legislation they will undo it later, because they will hear from their constituents again when they do it. And why? Because, for instance, if you pass this law throughout the whole South you will appreciate the products of corporate dairies, of men with large fortunes, while you will depreciate by \$2 a ton all the cotton seed that is sold in the South to a cotton-seed oil mill.

If petitions from farmers were any good, and if these cotton-seed oil people had had the foresight to go about it, they could have gotten a petition signed by every cotton farmer in the South, because practically none of them have any interest whatever in the dairy business, and every single one of them has an interest in the cotton-seed oil industry to the sake of making or losing \$2 a ton, according to whether you pass this bill or whether you do not pass it.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN. Do you think it would depreciate cotton-seed oil?

Mr. TOMPKINS. I know it.

Mr. KNIGHT. If there is any other representative of the cotton-seed interest here I would like to get him to give me the figures as to the interests of the cotton-seed oil people here. According to a little calculation I have made, the amount of cotton-seed oil used in oleomargarine constitutes less than two-thirds of 1 per cent of their gross output.

Mr. TOMPKINS. I can tell you right now that they have \$3,000,000 worth of interest a year in it, if this bill is passed in depreciation of the value of cotton seed. According to my estimate of 3,000,000 tons of cotton seed which are used for making oil every year, their loss would be \$6,000,000 a year—the loss of the cotton-seed people alone. Now, you would bleed the working people of the country of ten millions more, and you would bleed the stock people of five. That is what you would do. That is an estimate of the value, in dollars and cents, of these interests.

Not only the manufacturer of this oil is interested in maintaining this market for his product, but the Southern farmer who makes the seed out of which this oil is made is also interested, and surely there is no class of people in this country who need more help than the cotton farmers of the South, and against whom discriminating legislation is more unjust, for in all the prosperity about which we hear so much the cotton farmer of the South has had but little share.

While the prices of other products have gone up, the price of his, except for a little while during the year 1900, has ranged so low it is with difficulty he has been able to make a living. For these reasons he is weak and ill able to stand such a blow as this. True, he is sometimes a dairyman and makes a little butter to sell, but in the South there are at least 20 farmers and laborers who buy all the butter they consume to every Southern farmer who makes butter to sell, and the one who sells always finds a ready market at remunerative prices right at his door. I have had no petitions or letters from the farmers of my State for this bill, except from a few dairy farmers, and most of these bear evidence of having been inspired by the dairy trust.

When representatives of the cotton interests and the live-stock interests come here protesting against this legislation as injurious to their interests they are waived away and told that they do not know what they are talking about. One Senator the other day in the debate here rolled as a sweet morsel under his tongue the declaration of the Secretary of Agriculture with reference to the statement of a stock raiser that the passage of this bill would depreciate the value of beef cattle, when he said that "he does not know what he is talking about—that same cattle man."

The statements and representations and the petitions and appeals of the farmers of the South and the stock growers of the West fall upon deaf ears. They are told that they do not know what they are talking about, that they do not know what their interest is. Yet when we are considering tariff measures here and making schedules and imposing duties for the protection of home products against foreign products, the representatives of the great trust combinations and of the great protected industries come here and make all sorts of wild representations as to the effect of legislation upon their business, and they are accepted with childlike credulity and they are given whatever they demand.

That is what has often been seen here in the past. It will be seen again when we get to making tariff schedules. Representatives of these great combinations and protected interests who are selling their products in foreign markets for 25 and 30 per cent less than they are selling them in this country will come here and demand that the protection accorded them against foreign competition be continued, and with full knowledge of these facts as to the prices for which they are selling their products abroad their demands will be granted, and the protection they now enjoy but do not need will be continued.

Now, Mr. President, I say that the cotton-seed oil men are interested. Why do I say it?

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator from North Carolina permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. SIMMONS. Certainly, sir.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to know to what extent the protection of the cotton-seed oil interests is to be carried? As the Senator is probably well aware, it is now an absolute impossibility to buy a bottle of pure olive oil in this city. I will venture to say that no Senator can buy a bottle of olive oil in this city. Whether it has a French label or an Italian label, it is invariably principally cotton-seed oil. We can not buy a box of sardines, whether they are packed on the coast of Maine or on the shores of the Mediterranean, that they are not put up in cotton-seed oil and saturated with it. Does the Senator mean to say that we have got to justify the use of cotton-seed oil all along these lines when it masquerades as something which it is not?

Mr. SIMMONS. To the extent, Mr. President, that cotton-seed oil, or oleomargarine, or any other product masquerades for what it is not, I am just as willing and as anxious as the Senator to pass legislation which will put an end to that masquerading. If cotton-seed oil, or any other farm product in the South, has obtained any protection against the competition of olive oil or any other foreign product that is sold in this country

in competition with it, it has nothing more than what is due to it. Although we have not asked for it, as the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY] suggests, Southern interests are entitled to it, because in the application of the general principle of protection, without any regard to the right or wrong of that principle, it would be unjust to discriminate against the products of one section and in favor of the products of another section. If that is to be a principle of government, it should be administered with sectional impartiality.

But, Mr. President, that has nothing to do with the phase of this question which I am now discussing. It is not whether there should be protection against a foreign product, but whether we should inaugurate here in this country a system of internal tariff duties, and whether we should use the taxing power of the Government for the purpose of building up one home industry by destroying another. That is what this bill will do if it becomes a law. It is using the taxing power of the Government for the purpose of building up and promoting and fostering the dairy interests of this country at the expense of and to the injury of the cotton-seed oil interests and the stock-raising interests in this country.

Now, I say these cotton-seed-oil men know what they are talking about. They have protested and they do protest against this legislation. They have passed resolutions, they have sent petitions, and they have sent representatives here to Congress to present their grievances and to protest against this legislation.

When Mr. Tompkins, of my State, was before the committee, in his statement, to which I have before referred, he said that the destruction of the manufacture of oleomargarine in this country meant the depreciation to the extent of \$2 a ton for every ton of cotton-seed used in the manufacture of oleomargarine.

But you say that does not affect anything except the cotton seed that is used in oleomargarine. Mr. Tompkins answered that in his statement by saying that there was a sufficient demand made by the use of cotton seed in making oleo oil, and the price for the seed thus used was sufficiently high to raise the level of the price of the whole cotton-seed product of the South; that effect was not limited to the amount of seed used in the oil business, but extended to the whole product.

Speaking upon this same subject, another witness before the committee, Mr. Bond, said that the price paid for the seed used in the manufacture of oleo oil went far toward settling the price of the whole cotton-seed product of the South. That is but another way of stating a principle axiomatic in commerce, that the price of the surplus of an article fixes the price of the whole article. It is not the quantity used, but the high price paid and the fact that the market is sufficiently large to raise the price of the whole product to a certain level.

Mr. HARRIS. Just in that connection, I should be very glad if the Senator from North Carolina would state of what importance the use of cotton-seed oil as a substitute for olive oil would be in this relation.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am not prepared to answer the Senator as to that, for I know nothing about olive oil. I have never studied that question.

Mr. HARRIS. It would affect the California olive-oil product.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am sorry that I am not prepared to give any information to the Senator on that subject, but I do not possess it.

Mr. HARRIS. It is on the question affecting cotton-seed oil.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; it is germane, and I should like to answer the Senator's question, but I can not. I am not familiar with the uses and constituent elements of olive oil.

The advocates of this bill ridicule the idea that the interests of the growers of beef cattle and hogs will be seriously affected by it, and yet, Mr. President, we find the representatives of this interest from one end of the country to the other greatly stirred up over this legislation. They too have sent representatives before your committee to protest in most vigorous terms.

Associations representing these interests have passed vigorous resolutions of protest against it. I wish to present now the resolutions passed at a meeting of the National Live Stock Association, which met in Chicago last December. There were some 1,500 delegates in this convention, and about 130 branch organizations, scattered all over the country, were represented. The resolutions, which I will not read in full but ask permission to insert in my remarks, were adopted by the unanimous vote of this convention, and, I take it, embody the honest convictions of this body as to the effect of this legislation upon the live-stock interest of the country, all of which was represented except the dairy interest.

The following resolutions were unanimously adopted by the fifth annual convention of the National Live Stock Association, held in Chicago, Ill., December 3, 4, 5, 6, 1901:

"Whereas the National Live Stock Association has heretofore announced itself as unalterably opposed to that class of legislation which builds up one industry at the expense of another equally as meritorious, and has opposed the passage of the bill for a law known as the Grout bill, which certain dairy interests sought to have passed by the last Congress of the United States, but which failed to reach a vote; and

"Whereas unofficial notice has been served upon the officers of this association that this same measure will be reintroduced in the coming session of Congress and forced to an issue; and

"Whereas the openly expressed intention of the movers of this law is to destroy the manufacture of oleomargarine, a product of the packing house, which has been declared by Government authorities to be a pure food product as wholesome and healthful as butter; and

"Whereas the stockmen of the United States believe that this product should be sold upon its own merits, and favor any legislation that will prevent or compel the manufacturers to sell their product for just what it is, a substitute for butter, but draw the line on legislation that would unjustly hamper the industry by compelling the manufacturers to offer their product in a form that would make it offensive to the eye of the consumer, and consequently unpalatable; and

"Whereas the so-called 'Wadsworth' substitute for the Grout bill, offered in the last Congress, which provides that the oleomargarine product be only offered for sale in 1 and 2 pound packages, each package labeled in plain letters, meets with the approval of the members of this association: Therefore,

"Resolved, That the National Live Stock Association, in convention assembled, representing more than four billions of invested capital, reiterates its former expressed disapproval of such class legislation as the old Grout bill, and we protest against the passage of any law of this nature, firmly believing that such legislation is unjust, unconstitutional, and unfair, and not to be tolerated in a free country.

"Resolved, That we heartily approve of such legislation as the law proposed by the Wadsworth substitute in the last Congress, and we approve any legislation which, in a legitimate manner, compels manufacturers to offer their products for sale for just what they are.

"Resolved, That we heartily indorse the position taken by Hon. J. W. WADSWORTH, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture in the last Congress, and believe that in justice to him he should be retained as chairman of that committee in the present Congress. The thanks of this convention are due and are hereby tendered to Senators MONEY, of Mississippi; HEITFIELD, of Idaho; WARREN, of Wyoming, and BATE, of Tennessee, members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, for their able and successful opposition to the passage of the Grout bill during the closing session of the last Congress.

"Resolved, That the executive committee of this association be instructed to forward copies of these resolutions to Congress, and to take such action as it may think necessary and proper to oppose the passage of any bill containing such provisions as the so-called Grout bill."

Attest:

JOHN W. SPRINGER, President.  
CHAS. F. MARTIN, Secretary.

Mr. MITCHELL. May I ask the Senator from North Carolina a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MITCHELL. May I ask the Senator the purport of those resolutions?

Mr. SIMMONS. The general purport of those resolutions is condemnatory of this bill, and that this class of legislation is injurious to the interests of the stock growers.

It is positively asserted, not only by the breeders of beef cattle, but by dealers in beef cattle, that the use of oleo oil, made from the caul fat of steers, in oleomargarine has increased the value of this class of cattle from \$2 to \$3 a head, and by dealers in hogs that the use of the leaf fat of the hog in oleomargarine has increased the value of the hog 20 cents a head. In support of this contention they show that caul fat for use in oleomargarine brings 10 cents a pound, while for use in tallow it brings only 6 cents a pound; that leaf fat used in oleomargarine sells for 8½ cents a pound, while for lard it sells for only 6 cents a pound, and that the demand for these products for this purpose is sufficiently large to fix the price of the whole product, and that thus the value of caul fat and leaf fat has been raised, respectively, from 6 to 10 cents and from 6 to 8½ cents a pound.

Mr. John C. McCoy, a Western farmer and stock raiser, as well as commission merchant for the sale of cattle, appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry against this bill in the Fifty-sixth Congress, and I wish to present a part of his statements, giving statistics showing the effect of the passage of this measure upon the live-stock interests of the country:

Mr. McCoy. The average beef steer contains about 50 pounds of caul fat, and the average hog about 8 pounds of leaf fat. The market price to-day for caul fat for oleomargarine purposes is about 10 cents per pound, while tallow is worth about 6 cents; and the leaf fat for oleomargarine purposes 8½ cents per pound, and for lard only 6 cents. Those are very close approximate values.

There has been slaughtered in Kansas City since January 1, 1900, to date over 1,000,000 cattle, producing approximately 50,000,000 pounds of oleo oil, worth to-day for oleomargarine purposes 10 cents per pound, or \$5,000,000. Were it not for the demand the manufacture of oleomargarine has created for oleo oil, this product would have been sold for tallow at 6 cents per pound, netting \$3,000,000, a difference of \$2,000,000, or \$2 per head for each animal slaughtered.

During the period just mentioned there were slaughtered at Kansas City approximately 3,000,000 hogs, producing about 24,000,000 pounds of leaf fat, worth for oleomargarine purposes, at 8½ cents per pound, \$2,040,000. The demand for this product as an oleomargarine ingredient removed, it would have been sold for lard at 6 cents per pound, or \$1,440,000, a difference of \$600,000, or 20 cents per head for each hog slaughtered.

Had it not been possible to use these two products for oleomargarine purposes instead of tallow and lard, it would have cost the farmer marketing their stock at Kansas City this year \$2,600,000. The same is true at all the principal live-stock markets in proportion to their receipts. The five large Western markets—Chicago, Kansas City, St. Louis, Omaha, St. Joseph—have handled since January 1, 1900, to date, 6,500,000 cattle and 16,300,000 hogs. Of that number at least 75 per cent of the cattle, or 4,875, were slaughtered, and practically all of the hogs. A difference of \$2 per head on the cattle and 20 cents per head on the hogs would mean a loss to the Western farmers on their marketing of cattle and hogs for the year 1900 of \$13,000,000.

But, gentlemen, carry the reasoning still further. The Government report shows that on January 1, 1900, there were in the United States 27,610,000

cattle other than milch cows, or cattle available sooner or later for beef. A depreciation of \$2 per head on them would mean \$55,230,000. The same authority gives the number of hogs in the United States on January 1, 1899, approximately, 88,650,000.

**THE CHAIRMAN.** Would it reduce the value of the milch cow to have the manufacture of oleomargarine stopped? I thought you included all the cattle.

**MR. MCCOY.** No, sir; I included only the cattle other than milch cows. The Government makes a distinction. It would reduce the value of the milch cow, because the ultimate destination of all cattle is the block. Milch cows are used for a long time for milk purposes, but unless they should happen to die of old age, which the farmer generally sees is not the case, the ultimate destination of the milch cow is the block.

**MR. PROCTOR.** Mr. President—

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Vermont?

**MR. SIMMONS.** Yes, sir.

**MR. PROCTOR.** I should like to ask the Senator from North Carolina if he does not recollect the testimony of Mr. Hobbs, who represented the opposition to this bill before the committee—he stated that the total number of cattle slaughtered in this country was about 11,000,000—and if, taking the total amount of oleo oil used in oleomargarine, the figures would not show that the amount was not over 25 cents and a fraction per head.

**MR. SIMMONS.** I do not remember that statement.

**MR. PROCTOR.** The Senator will find that the totals that were submitted to the committee figured about 25 cents per head.

**MR. SIMMONS.** I do not remember to have heard that. I do not dispute that he made the statement which the Senator has quoted.

But there is not only the testimony of Mr. McCoy, but the great preponderance of testimony, nearly all of the testimony in fact taken by the committee, tended to show that the depreciation in the value of beef cattle as the result of this legislation would be from two to three dollars per head. I think the National Live Stock Association so asserted in their resolutions.

Of course I do not know whether or not these statements are true; but I know they come from men who are engaged in the business of raising and selling cattle and hogs. They are supposed to know something about the effect of this legislation—not its future effect, for they are not speaking about that, but its past effect upon their product—and I am willing to take their statement as at least approximating the truth in this matter.

Not only the cotton-seed-oil interests and live-stock interests, but the labor organizations, have sent representatives here. Mr. Patrick Dolan, president of the United Mine Workers' Association, and another gentleman, Mr. John Pierce, representing the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, appeared here in the interest of the tens of thousands of laborers belonging to these great labor organizations. Let me read two short extracts from the statements of these two labor leaders. First I read from the statement of President Dolan, as follows:

Our people, Mr. Chairman, are against the passage of the measure. I represent over 40,000 miners and their families, and I know from the sentiment in other sections of the country to which I go, from talking to people who are interested in our organization, that they do not want to be deprived of the ability to purchase this wholesome article of food. If it is not made in a wholesome way, then they do not want it; but if it is just as good to them to spread their bread with as 35-cent butter, they do want it. And if this measure passes, the chances are that butter will go up to 50 cents, and poor people will not be able to purchase it at all.

Now, let me read from the statement of Mr. Pierce:

The interest of the consumer seems not to have been considered at all, the sole idea apparently being that the creameryman and dairyman should have a monopoly of the entire market for their wares, by rendering a competing product so unattractive that nobody would care to purchase it. Do you think that all the workmen of western Pennsylvania or of these United States (a portion of whom I represent in the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers) can afford to pay 35 cents per pound for creamery butter, which is the present price for the first-class article in Pittsburgh? Everyone, I think, will admit that all can not.

If this bill passes, what position are we in? On examination we find that we will have three options, viz, (1) creamery butter at 35 cents, if the conditions are no worse, and I am not sure but that the passage of this bill may make it 50 cents per pound; (2) colored oleo at 25 cents per pound, on account of the 10-cent tax; (3) white oleo at 15 cents.

Colored oleomargarine is at present retailed at from 12½ to 20 cents per pound. On investigation I am satisfied that most of our people are paying about 15 cents per pound for it, and I can not admit that those who buy it can afford to pay more. I therefore arrive at the conclusion that they must either find 10 cents per pound more to pay this proposed robbery—for I can not dignify it by the name of tax—or buy and eat white oleomargarine. And this to satisfy the greed of the manufacturers of butter, who think that white oleomargarine is good enough for those who can not afford to pay 10 cents additional for yellow, or the 20 cents or more additional for creamery butter, or use the off grades of butter now unsalable as food.

But, Mr. President, in answer to these petitions and resolutions and representations of the mill men and farmers and stock growers, we are told that there is very little oleomargarine manufactured and sold in this country, and that these interests will be but slightly affected by the destruction of this industry. It is true there is not a very great amount of oleomargarine manufactured now; only a little over 100,000,000 pounds a year.

And yet the amount of oleomargarine consumed in some of the States of this Union where there has been no hostile legislation, such as Rhode Island, for illustration, where 8 pounds per capita is consumed a year, shows conclusively that if this industry were encouraged instead of handicapped that we would be producing

and selling in this country to-day probably half as much oleomargarine as we are selling butter; and but for the prejudice that has been created against it by agitation and misrepresentation in the interest of the dairy we would probably be manufacturing and using as much per capita in this country as they use per capita in Denmark. And upon that basis, instead of a demand in this country for 100,000,000 pounds, there would be a demand for at least 1,300,000,000 pounds.

If the comparatively small amount of cotton seed and the comparatively small amount of oleo oil and neutral oil used in the manufacture of 100,000,000 pounds now used is a source of benefit to the cattle farmer and hog raiser, as they all unite in saying there is, how much greater would be the profits and how much greater would be the demands for these farm products if this industry had been unfettered and allowed to expand to the proportions to which it would undoubtedly have attained but for this adverse legislation and agitation. In considering the effect of prospective legislation upon an industry, it is not fair, nor is it the American way, to look only at its condition when fettered and hampered by adverse environments, but also to look to what would be and will be its state if protected by fair and just laws.

Mr. President, there is another interest in this country affected by this legislation which is more entitled to the consideration of Congress than the interest of the farmer, or the manufacturer of oil, or the raiser of beef, and that is the great army of consumers in this country. They are mostly poor people; they are laboring people; they work on the farms; they work in the factories; they work in the mines, and they can not afford to pay high prices for the products which they consume.

In oleomargarine they have found a cheap article which, since they have come to learn that it is a healthy article, a nutritious article, is entirely satisfactory to them. They buy it; they use it extensively, and they can afford to pay the price for which it is sold; but they can not afford to pay the high prices of dairy butter. Much less can they afford, after this legislation goes into effect, which will drive oleomargarine from the market, and make a scarce market, and therefore a high-price market, to buy dairy butter at the high price to which it will go, for I believe, and the laboring people believe, and they state that belief in the memorials to which I have just referred, that in their opinion the result of this legislation will be to put the price of dairy butter up to 40 or 50 cents a pound. Then they will not be able to buy it at all.

These laboring people, as well as all other consumers of butter or any of its substitutes, are entitled to consideration in connection with this question. With oleomargarine out of the way we will have to look solely and exclusively to the cow for butter.

It is sheer nonsense to talk about the capacity of the cows of this country to supply unaided a cheap butter. There are not enough milk cows now to do it, and there will not be in a reasonable time enough to do it. There are only about 17,000,000 milk cows in the United States, and there are between seventy-five and eighty millions of people to be supplied. Strike down oleomargarine and you will do a great thing for the great trusts that now control the dairy interests of the country. It will give them the finest market in the world free and without competition. The rich will have to pay a little more for their butter, but they will be able to get what they want. The poor man will either have to pay more for his butter than he can afford to pay or he will have to go without it.

But, Mr. President, there is another ground upon which we who oppose this bill base our opposition to it, higher than that of the pecuniary interest of the producers of either butter or oleomargarine or the products out of which they are made. It is opposition to special legislation. This bill is special legislation of the most dangerous character. It has long been the custom in this country to use the taxing power of the Government to protect the products of home industries against the productions of foreign countries. The right or wrong of this I do not now propose to discuss, but this is the first time in our history that it has been proposed, deliberately proposed, to use the taxing power of the Government to build up one home interest by pulling down another.

If you start upon this legislation, where are you going to end? There was introduced in the House of Representatives the other day a bill which proposes to brand and mark an article of commerce known as shoddy. Shoddy is a material made largely from cotton goods, but in imitation of wool. There is but a small modicum of wool in it, but it looks like wool; it feels like wool; it is bought and worn as wool by poor people; but they know it is not wool because of the difference in price between these shoddy goods and genuine wool. Yet it is proposed now to brand and mark that in the interests of wool.

I know the bill to which I have referred was introduced by an opponent of the pending bill, as I am, but by a man impregnated with this idea of class legislation, as I am not. I think the bill obnoxious in a large measure to the same objections which should obtain against the the pending measure. It is not proposed in

that bill to tax shoddy, but what will be the next step? The next step in the evolution of this scheme and system of legislation would lead to the taxing of shoddy for what? In the interest of the sheep, just as it is proposed here to tax oleomargarine in the interest of the cow.

There is another imitation product in this country sold as silk. It is a very common article made in imitation of genuine silk. I do not know exactly the materials which are in it, but there is very little silk in it. Yet under the skillful manipulation of the adulterants of clothing it has been wrought in imitation of silk. You can not easily tell it from silk. Poor people buy it and wear it because it is cheap and because it looks like silk, and nobody except an expert can tell it is not the silk which the rich lady wears. Under the theory of this bill there is no reason why that product should not be taxed out of existence, and it would be, I suppose, if there was much silk grown and manufactured in this country.

There is a long train of similar articles that could be brought under the ban of this same class of legislation and taxed to death in the interest of some other article which it resembles called the genuine article.

If we enter upon this species of legislation, Mr. President, we shall soon have established here in America a system of internal tariff taxation very much akin to that which we now have upon our statute books applying to foreign trade, and we shall have, first, one product taxed in the interest of another and for the protection of another; then we shall have the products of one section taxed in the interest and for the protection of the products of another section; and, finally, we shall have Congress exercising its powers and its functions under the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution in order to give the States, as it is proposed now to give them in this bill, a free hand to legislate independently of the protection of that clause against the interests of other States, and we shall have here in this country that very condition of State discrimination and State exclusion that played such an important figure in the original formation of the Government under which we live.

Mr. President, there are other features of this matter which I should like to discuss and which I intended to discuss, but I shall not trespass any further upon the patience of the Senate.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, I have been very much interested, as I have no doubt all have been who have listened to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] in his able discussion of this question. I only desire at this time to refer to one or two minor points. One is the matter of the live-stock interests in the manufacture of oleomargarine. It is very easy for men interested in live stock to make the offhand statement that it would entail a loss of two or three dollars a head if this bill should be enacted into law. It is true, as the Senator from North Carolina states, that representatives of the live-stock industry did make such statements in a hearing held a year ago this winter—I do not recollect any such statements this winter—but, the figures show how that is.

Mr. John F. Hobbs, the editor of the National Provisioner, of New York, a man whose opinion doubtless is as accurate as any man's can be in the absence of statistics which would show exactly, was before the committee in the interest of the live-stock people. He has been the manager of the opposition to this measure, and has carried on largely the correspondence with the opponents of the measure—the oleomargarine manufacturers. He gives the total number of cattle slaughtered in this country annually at 11,000,000 head. The total amount, according to the census bulletin, of oleo oil used in manufactures in this country is \$3,744,235 worth, but it is not all used in the manufacture of oleomargarine. It appeared before the committee that some of it was used for other purposes, the manufacture of soap, for instance; but admitting for the sake of argument that every dollar of it is used in the manufacture of oleomargarine, and figuring out the result, it gives 24 cents 9.4 mills, a fraction under 25 cents, as the total amount of oleo oil used per head of cattle.

I wish to make one other statement. The Senator from North Carolina speaks—and I agree with him in that—of process and renovated and adulterated butter. His suggestions in that regard differ from those of other Senators who favor this bill, and I agree with the Senator that this measure should deal impartially with all those products. I think he will find, if the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. HARRIS] is adopted, that it does deal impartially and fairly with all adulterations and mixtures of butter that pass as butter, and that he will find when the measure is perfected by that amendment that it is in effect, so far as butter is concerned, a pure-food bill and a class of legislation that is certainly just and right and demanded by the people.

Mr. SPOONER. I should like to ask the Senator a question. How much does the Senator from Vermont think the cattle raisers get out of the profits of the beef combine from the by-products of the cattle? In other words, how much does it affect the price?

Mr. PROCTOR. I think that is a question that could be better

answered by the great purchasers and raisers of live stock themselves.

Mr. MITCHELL obtained the floor.

Mr. HEITFELD. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. MITCHELL. Certainly.

Mr. HEITFELD. How much does the tariff on hides bring the owner of cattle?

Mr. SPOONER. I will answer that question just as the Senator from Vermont answered my question—I do not know; but I have had a very grave suspicion that it did not make very much difference.

Mr. HEITFELD. Still, it was contended here during the tariff debate that the tariff was placed on hides in the interest of the cattle raiser.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. In view of the statement made by the Senator from Vermont, I should like to ask if it is the intention of the Senator or of the committee to support or accept the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. HARRIS]?

Mr. PROCTOR. I will say to the Senator that it is.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I do not rise to make any extended remarks on this bill. I do desire to say, however, that I favor this scheme of legislation. I am in favor of the passage of this bill as reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I rise now for the simple purpose—because I think it is in line just at this point in the debate—of contributing, for the information of the Senate and of the country, an article published in the New York Herald of last Friday on the subject of the beef trust.

It seems to be admitted here that those engaged in that industry are severely hostile to this piece of legislation; that they are fighting it from every conceivable standpoint, because, as the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] suggests to me, they make the product of oleomargarine and imagine that this proposed legislation is going to interfere somewhat with their business. As bearing, however, upon that question and as an answer to the resolutions which the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] said a few moments ago had been adopted by the live stock men at Chicago, I desire to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the article to which I have attracted attention.

The price of beef it seems to me has advanced all over the country to the consumer very largely in the last few months. It has been very noticeably so. It has advanced 2 or 3 cents a pound. The beef trust I am advised are coining their millions out of this industry. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks this article in the New York Herald. I do not pretend to vouch for the truth of all the statements contained in this article. I do pretend, however, to vouch for the truth of the statement that the New York Herald is one of our great metropolitan papers, and I believe no paper in the country stands any higher or receives more universal approval in its statements generally than does the New York Herald. It is all that I desire to say, and if I can have unanimous consent to insert this article, and the whole of it, I shall be obliged to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CULLOM. Have it read.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is too long.

Mr. BACON. Before the Senator from Oregon takes his seat, I should like to ask him a question, with his permission.

Mr. MITCHELL. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. It requires that I should make a brief statement before I submit the question. I do not suggest this as a jest. I should premise it, however, by stating that the Senator represents a constituency largely interested in the canning of salmon.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is a fact.

Mr. BACON. I saw in the papers a year or two ago that a company had been organized somewhere on the Mississippi River—the Upper Mississippi, I believe—the business of which was to be the catching of catfish, coloring the catfish in semblance of salmon, canning it, and selling it as salmon. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not he would favor a tax of 10 per cent on that industry in order to protect the salmon industry of Oregon?

Mr. MITCHELL. I suppose they are cooked in cotton-seed oil.

Mr. BACON. That may be; but I am not on cotton-seed oil now; I am on colored catfish. I desire to ask the Senator whether in the prosecution of this same idea he would desire to have the catfish industry taxed to the extent of 10 cents a pound in order to protect the Oregon salmon industry?

Mr. MITCHELL. When the Senator from Georgia is in earnest—

Mr. BACON. I certainly am.

Mr. MITCHELL. We always pay the greatest respect to him, but when he gets funny—

Mr. BACON. I do state with the utmost sincerity that there has been such a statement published. Whether true or not, I do not know. The Senator is quoting a newspaper, and I simply vouch for the fact that I saw such a statement in the newspapers, as the Senator vouches for the fact that he sees this article in the Herald.

Mr. SPOONER. It was a joke.

Mr. BACON. It was not supposed to be. I wish to test the sincerity of the position the Senator from Oregon occupies. I want to know whether in such a case, not limiting it to the butter industry, the Senator is in favor of taxing such a spurious product in order to protect the salmon industry of the Pacific coast, and also in all other similar cases, or whether he wishes to limit it to this particular one.

Mr. MITCHELL. The question of the salmon industry is not now before the Senate. When there comes before the Senate a proposition to tax something in connection with the salmon industry, then I will talk about it with the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BACON. Then I will ask the Senator this question, with his permission: Whether he is in favor of extending legislation of this kind to all other industries which are manufacturing articles in competition with some other articles, in order that the genuine article may be protected at the expense of the spurious article?

Mr. MITCHELL. It will be time enough for me to answer that question when a proposition comes before the Senate to tax some other industry. The only question before the Senate now is in reference to oleomargarine.

Mr. BACON. The Senator is not prepared to say that if the same facts exist—

Mr. MITCHELL. It is not necessary for me to say it. It is not necessary even to answer the fish story of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BACON. It is not a question of necessity—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. MITCHELL. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. The Senator is not under any necessity to answer anything; but possibly there might be a consistency in his supporting all legislation of this kind under similar circumstances and an inconsistency in limiting it to this particular case, and I simply desired to know whether the honorable Senator intended to be consistent or inconsistent. It is not necessary that he should answer it. We would be very much edified, however, if he would give us an answer.

Mr. MITCHELL. I always aim to be consistent, and whenever any measure comes up here I will endeavor to act in such a way that I will not be open to the charge of inconsistency. As I said before, I do not vouch for the truth of every statement contained in the article, but we all know that the New York Herald is a cosmopolitan paper which stands along at the head of the list, and when statements such as are contained in this article are made in a paper like that, bearing so intimately and directly upon the question now under consideration by the Senate, I thought it was nothing more than proper and right, or at least permissible, to use no stronger term, to have them brought to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. BACON. Nobody objects to that.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is all I have to say, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none.

The article referred to is as follows:

BEEF TRUST SQUEEZES POOR FOR \$100,000,000—CAPACITY OF THE CHICAGO COMBINATION SHOWN BY THE LATEST ADVANCE IN PRICES—HUNGRY GO HUNGRIER; MEAT MADE A LUXURY—RECEIPTS OF FOUR CONCERNS REACH MORE THAN A HALF BILLION A YEAR—HOME INDUSTRY IS KILLED—LOCAL SLAUGHTERERS AND RETAILERS MUST BOW TO THE WILL OF THE WEST—NEW YORK'S SUPPLY REGULATED—HOW MUCH THIS CITY SHALL CONSUME IS DECIDED ON IN ADVANCE TO A POUND—BEEF TRUST'S TRADE HALF A BILLION A YEAR.

Annual trade controlled by the beef trust.....	\$600,000,000
Annual business handled by the leading members of the combination:	
Swift & Co.....	200,000,000
Armour & Co.....	190,000,000
Nelson Morris & Co.....	95,000,000
G. H. Hammond & Co.....	75,000,000

Business controlled by four packing-house firms in the beef trust..... 560,000,000

Absolutely controlling trade aggregating \$600,000,000 annually, the unofficial combination of interests known as the beef trust has succeeded, after many years of organization and expansion, in so completely dominating the provision markets of the United States that independent competition is killed. The strategic policy of the beef trust has become steadily more despotic and aggressive, until wholesale and retail butchers in New York and other cities who will not sign the ironclad agreement of the Chicago com-

bination are driven out of business by scores, both by being cut off from supplies and being openly undersold by agencies especially established for the purpose of crushing competition.

The latest "squeeze" engineered by orders from the pooled interests of the houses forming the trust is the boldest on record, and the middlemen and consuming population of New York have been forced to pay, within the last week, advances on prices already abnormally high of from 3 to 4 cents for beef, mutton, and pork. There has been a similar rise in other cities, until the increased profits of the beef trust over the scale of 1901 are conservatively estimated at \$100,000,000.

The recent movement makes fresh meat an almost prohibitive luxury to thousands of families in this city.

It is within the power of the beef trust to order another advance and pocket another \$100,000,000 with the mere labor of telegraphing the new schedule to their agents in every city and town in the United States.

Of the \$600,000,000 of yearly business, \$560,000,000 is handled by only four firms, who cooperate to the smallest details of regulating supply and demand from the stockyards to the retail markets. These are Armour & Co., Swift & Co., G. H. Hammond & Co., and Nelson A. Morris & Co. Their recent action in "skying" prices has aroused murmurs of open rebellion from New York meat dealers, but the beef trust employs a staff of experts whose business it is to whip the recalcitrant dealers back into line—to make them submit or be driven out of business.

#### DO NOT BID AGAINST EACH OTHER.

The combination to restrict trade in any kind of meats begins in the extensive stockyards of Chicago, St. Louis, St. Joseph, Kansas City, Omaha, and St. Paul. In these live-stock centers the cattle buyers for the houses of Armour, Swift, Morris, and Hammond never "cross bid" each other. If one of Armour's men sees an agent from Swift's bidding on one lot he does not interfere, but leaves the seller to take the price offered or keep his stock. If shipments are light or from any cause stock is scarce enough to cause a natural advance in the stockyard market, the trust agents avoid all purchases until the sellers are forced to come to their terms. Whenever independent buyers show pernicious activity, the beef-trust men, by united action and understanding, sweep the yards clean of stock to bar out competition and advance prices. Because of the lack of organized system the opposition can not market its purchases at these inflated prices. It must yield to the combination or quit business.

Having disposed of all competition on the hoof in the great cattle centers of the West, the trust next obtains from the railroads rebates which "squeeze" any possible rivals out of the competition in the cost of freight transportation. Products are, therefore, placed at any point in the country to be sold if necessary at prices which can not be met and fought in the local markets by dealers who kill their beef in their own countryside.

This system of underselling has been the club with which local slaughterers have been smashed right and left. These, together with the wholesale butchers and the feeding and fattening industry, which used to be the most profitable branch of small farming, are being rapidly driven out of existence. These men are now forced to work for or buy of the trust, or look elsewhere for a livelihood.

When the markets are reached the operation of the combination's system has been as follows: The wholesale butchers were asked to sell the trust products on commission, instead of buying from the farmers. Every dealer won over to the commission basis bagged two birds with one stone by removing a healthy competitor and compelling the farmer to find another market for his stock.

When the dealer declined to be won over the trust promptly opened an agency in his territory and pushed Western beef at prices suicidal to the opposition, which had to surrender for lack of resources. This warfare was carried the length and breadth of the United States, and then the field was ready for the next step.

#### INDEPENDENCE CRUSHED.

The commission merchants had a shred of independence left, and this must be taken from them. So they were forced to give up selling the meat products on commission and accept salaries as agents for one of the packing houses merged in the beef trust. If they refused, hostilities were revived by again opening agencies in the locality and selling at prices ruinous to the merchant. It is only a question of a very short time, under this system, before the salary proposition is accepted, and by the system the branch houses of the trust have been multiplied throughout the country.

This policy has been kept steadily in view since the organization of the great packing-house combination about twenty-five years ago.

A later development of the crusade was the establishment in large cities of local slaughterhouses, whose management is veiled behind firm names of their former proprietors.

#### REVOLT IN THE HUDSON VALLEY.

Light is thrown on the working of this system by the first organized protest against the jump in prices of the last week, which is voiced not by the dealers of New York, but the butchers of Fishkill Landing and Matteawan, who are up in arms against the beef trust as a measure of business life and death.

A meeting was held yesterday in which they decided that they must somehow fortify themselves against the torrent of high prices which, they said, was "sweeping them off the earth."

All the dealers in these localities must buy their meats of the Armour, Morris, or Swift companies, which have large cold-storage houses across the river at Newburgh. Coupled with the most prohibitive prices is the enforcement of the rule compelling them to make weekly cash settlements, under the penalty of refusal by the agencies to let them have a pound of meat. These dealers took no alarm when last week an advance of 1 cent a pound, wholesale, was made by the trust. Another advance, yesterday, to a 10-cent average rate per pound caused them to organize in self-defense.

#### SQUEEZING THE CONSUMER.

They decided to raise retail prices from 2 to 3 cents a pound and to give no customer credit for more than a week. If payment was delayed, the patron would not be allowed to buy meat at any shop in the town. This was a putting into operation of the methods of the beef trust on a retail scale. Before the trust invaded the Hudson River Valley, beef was sold wholesale at 7 cents a pound, and the retail dealers were able to command the prices they now have to ask because of the recent advances. Beef is higher in this region than was ever before recorded. The farmers can do almost nothing to ease the situation, because the trust has driven all the local slaughterhouses out of business.

In Jersey City alone 17 retail meat dealers have been compelled to close their shops, all forced to the wall by the packing-house branches in the town. The most despotic branch of the machinery and the part of the system which shows most impressively the complete interaction of the combination of interests has been devised for the purpose of keeping under control the army of dealers who must buy all their meat provisions from the trust houses. This is a "clearing-house" system, by which the entire trade, controlled by the combination in New York, Brooklyn, and Jersey City, is kept under daily and almost hourly supervision.

This "arbitration office" is maintained pro rata by the packing houses, which work under an agreement, with penalties of fines and forfeitures

strictly enforced. The management of this central office has free access and makes visits at unexpected hours to all the books and workings of the branches of the different members of the beef trust.

#### BLACKLIST IN OPERATION.

No butcher is allowed more than a week's credit, and failure to comply with the agreement means that he is "blacklisted" in every branch controlled by the trust.

The trust agreement under which this "clearing house" is operated is so jealously guarded that every agent in possession of one is held personally responsible for its secrecy. Rather than submit it to the test of the courts and risk an examination of the "blacklisting" system, there have been repeated instances of exasperated customers who, refusing to pay little bills they believed unjust, were not even threatened with proceedings.

#### NEW YORK'S SUPPLY REGULATED.

The supply of meat allowed New York by the grace of the trust is regulated in this central office.

Each member of the combination is allotted a certain number of carloads to be shipped from the West each week to a tabulated list of cities and towns in the East. If for any reason trade is dull in New York, a certain number of cars is cut out for the week following and some of those on the way held back or switched to other points to keep prices up in this market. In the arbitration office prices are fixed a week ahead, and instructions accordingly given to the managers of the branch houses. No cars can be unloaded nor a pound of meat sold unless these daily instructions are followed to the letter.

The sales and credit standing of every dealer compelled to buy of a trust concern are regularly reported to the "clearing house," and are open for consultation by any of its affiliated houses. It is useless for him to transfer his account from Armour to Swift or from Morris to Hammond, no matter if he has been ill used, or is, perhaps, the victim of a clerical error. There are no disputes, because the verdict of the central office is final and absolute. Such facts as these sufficiently demonstrate the existence of the beef trust, combining every essential element of a combination effected to restrain trade and crush natural competition.

#### ADVANCES IN PRICES OF MEAT HAVE NETTED TRUST \$100,000,000.

Advances in prices ordered by the beef trust to "squeeze" the retailer and consumer within one year:

#### WHOLESALE.

	1901.	1902.
	Cents.	Cents.
Dressed beef, per pound	6½	9½
Lamb, per pound	8	11½
Mutton, per pound	8	11
Veal, per pound	8	13
Pork, per pound	6	9

#### RETAIL.

Sirloin steak, per pound	16	20
Porterhouse steak, per pound	20	22
Round steak, per pound	16	18
Mutton, per pound	12	14
Lamb, per pound	12	15

Estimated profits divided among members of the beef trust out of the arbitrary advance in prices during 1901-1902, \$100,000,000.

While there has been an increase of from 2 to 4 cents a pound in the face of prices already abnormally high, American meats are being sold in Europe by the beef trust at prices much lower than in the United States. Yet the agents of the beef trust claim that the unprecedented price advances are caused by a scarcity of live stock in the West.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, I have listened with a good deal of interest to the discussions of the bill under consideration. I have devoted considerable time to an examination of the testimony taken by the Committee on Agriculture during the investigation conducted by it last year, which makes a volume of nearly 900 pages, and a record of the investigation made by the House and Senate committees also during the present session of Congress, and the impression has come to me with great force that the question presented by the pending bill is one which has aroused the interest of the whole country, and is perhaps affecting a greater number of people directly or indirectly than any other question which has been considered at this session.

The main feature of this measure, as I understand it, is the reduction of the tax on oleomargarine in its natural state from 2 cents a pound to one-fourth of 1 cent a pound and the increase of the tax provided by the act of 1886 from 2 cents a pound to 10 cents a pound upon that portion of oleomargarine which is colored in imitation of butter.

The agitation of this question has excited the interest of three classes of people in this country. The record to which I have referred shows that the producers of oleomargarine have appeared before the committees by attorneys, by agents, by witnesses. The great agricultural interests have been in like manner represented, and we have before us the record of the anti-color laws now in force in 32 of the States, representing the opinions of 80 per cent of the inhabitants of the nation.

It is not necessary to discuss the magnitude of the agricultural industry. That has already been done. Nor is it necessary that I should discuss in detail the growth of the oleomargarine industry. It is enough to say that within the last twenty years it has assumed proportions and forms that have attracted universal interest.

Now, sir, I stand here to say that when oleomargarine is presented to this country as oleomargarine, when it is put upon sale as and for what it really is, I am heartily in favor of giving it a free field and an opportunity for a fair fight. I am of the opinion that the American people are entitled to choose what they shall

eat and what they shall drink so long as the articles selected are wholesome and do not endanger health; but when an article is placed upon the market under a false color, in a false guise, intended to deceive, and which does deceive, then it is that the consumers have a vital interest in the matter and they have the right to come and claim legislation which shall protect them against deception and fraud.

When oleomargarine was first placed upon the market in this country, it is true, as suggested by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], that there was a time when the production and sale of oleomargarine was believed to be against public policy and the use of it dangerous to the health of the people, because of the action of unprincipled producers, who, it was alleged, employed unwholesome materials in its preparation. There is no question but that the prejudice was well founded, as is well evinced by a remark in President Cleveland's message sent to the Congress of the United States at the time of the adoption of the law of 1886. He said:

Nor should there be opposition to the incidental effect of this legislation on the part of those who profess to be engaged honestly and fairly in the manufacture and sale of a wholesome and valuable article of food which by its provisions may be subject to taxation. As long as their business is carried on under cover and by false pretenses such men have bad companions in those whose manufactures, however vile and harmful, take their place without challenge with the better sort in a common crusade of deceit against the public. But if this occupation and its methods are forced into the light and all these manufactures must thus either stand upon their merits or fall, the good and bad must soon part company and the fittest only will survive.

What President Cleveland prophesied has come to pass, and today, I apprehend, under the influence of the law of 1886, there is such a supervision of the manufacture of oleomargarine that what its friends claim for it as to the wholesomeness of materials and cleanliness in preparation is practically true. The State laws adopted during that period of its history prohibited to a very large extent the manufacture or sale of oleomargarine in any form. In several instances they were held to be unconstitutional. At a later period legislation, intended to apprise the purchaser of the character of the article, was adopted requiring that oleomargarine offered for sale should be colored pink. This law was also held to be unconstitutional as prohibitive in its character in a case that came up to the Supreme Court from the State of New Hampshire. But in 1891 the legislature of Massachusetts enacted a statute which forbade the sale of oleomargarine in that State when it was made in imitation of yellow butter. Its constitutionality was tested in the courts of that State and later, by appeal, in the Supreme Court of the United States in what is known as the Plumley case, by which court the statute was held to be valid, one that the State had a right to enact, one that it could put in operation, one that tended to protect the people from the imposition of having that which was not butter sold under the guise of butter, whereby the great public was defrauded.

Other States have followed in the lead of Massachusetts in adopting what are known as anticolor laws until 32 of them now have such statutes in force. These statutes represent 60,000,000 of people, 80 per cent of the entire population of the United States.

The danger to the people believed to exist through the introduction of oleomargarine was brought to the attention of Congress, and in 1886 a bill was introduced in the House providing for a tax of 10 cents a pound upon that article; but as the discussion proceeded the rate was reduced from 10 cents to 5 cents. The bill passed the House and came to the Senate, where the rate of taxation was still further reduced from 5 cents to 2 cents, and the bill became a law.

The same opposition was brought to bear against the passage of that bill that is brought to bear against the pending measure. The same classes appeared against it. The same arguments were urged against its passage, and we find again, referring to President Cleveland's message, that he had become aware of the impending danger and was fully in sympathy with legislation which should protect the people against imposition. He said:

Not the least important incident related to this legislation is the defense afforded to the consumer against the fraudulent substitution and sale of an imitation for a genuine article of food of very general household use. Notwithstanding the immense quantity of the article described in this bill which is sold to the people for their consumption as food, and notwithstanding the claim made that its manufacture supplies a cheap substitute for butter, I venture to say that hardly a pound ever entered a poor man's house under its real name and in its true character.

That was the opinion of the President of the United States at that time. He goes further than that and says:

While in its relation to an article of this description there should be no governmental regulation of what the citizen shall eat, it is certainly not a cause of regret if by legislation of this character he is afforded a means by which he may better protect himself against imposition in meeting the needs and wants of his daily life.

Some question has been raised in this debate as to the right of the Government to tax colored oleomargarine in the manner provided in this bill. I do not know that anybody has ever directly raised the question of the constitutionality of the law of 1886 just referred to in any case which has gone to the Supreme Court of the United States for final adjudication, and the proposed law is

simply an amendment of the law of 1886, reducing the tax on uncolored oleomargarine and increasing it on that which has been colored in semblance of butter. The nearest approach of the court to that question that has come to my knowledge is contained in the case of *In re Kollock*, in which the Supreme Court uses this language:

The act is on its face an act for levying taxes and, although it may operate in so doing to prevent deception in the sale of oleomargarine as and for butter, its primary object must be assumed to be the raising of revenue, \* \* \* and, considered as a revenue act, the designation of the stamps, marks, and brands is merely a discharge of an administrative function, etc.

I do not know, I say, that the question has ever been directly raised under that statute, but the constitutionality of the act is evidently assumed by the court in the decision to which I have just referred.

The decision that this side of the Chamber has most depended upon as supporting the validity of this measure is found in the case of *Veazie Bank v. Fenno*, 8 Wall. This was a case arising under the statute which taxed the circulation of State banks and in the opinion upon the question whether the right of taxation was so excessive as to indicate a purpose on the part of Congress to destroy the franchise of the bank, and therefore beyond the constitutional power of Congress, the court says:

The first answer to this is that the judicial can not prescribe to the legislative department of the Government limitations upon the exercise of its acknowledged powers. The power to tax may be exercised oppressively upon persons, but the responsibility of the legislature is not to the courts, but to the people by whom its members are elected. So if a particular tax bears heavily upon a corporation, or a class of corporations, it can not, for that reason only, be pronounced contrary to the Constitution.

One of the attorneys who appeared before the committee of which my colleague is chairman, Mr. Rathbone Gardner, attorney for the Oakdale Manufacturing Company, admits the constitutionality of this legislation. He says:

I do not go into the question of the constitutionality of the proposed act. I have felt that the act would be pronounced constitutional on the same ground that other acts which imposed a tax the purpose of which was really not the collection of revenue have been pronounced by the courts of the United States to be constitutional; upon the same ground upon which I think that the oleomargarine act of 1886 has been by the circuit court pronounced constitutional—upon the ground that the courts of the United States can not impugn the purposes, motives, or intentions of the legislative body.

Mr. President, I had intended to examine the cases that were referred to by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY], but it is unnecessary to do so. The *Topeka* case to which he refers is that of the *Loan Association v. Topeka*, 20 Wall. There is no question about the law there laid down. That case simply raised the question of the validity of a law taxing the public to obtain money which the city proposed either to loan or to give to a manufacturing concern as an inducement to establish in their city a plant for the manufacture of iron bridges, if I remember it correctly. The other cases cited were along precisely the same line. The principle sustained in those cases is elemental. Nobody disputes the soundness of it. But the law under which this tax is imposed is altogether a different one. This tax is imposed for the benefit of the General Government. It is not given to anybody. Those cases can only be made applicable upon the supposition that this legislation is intended to stamp out an industry and to upbuild another one at its expense, and that is not the fact. It is intended to lay the tax upon the false, the spurious, and to reduce the tax upon that which is genuine and has the merit which is claimed for it.

Mr. President, there is in the United States the greatest market for butter which the world affords. The people of the United States have been educated to the use of butter. They know its history. They know its character. They know its quality. Ever since the time mentioned by the eloquent Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], when Abraham welcomed the angels that came to visit him by bringing forth butter for their refreshment, down to the present time, butter, the product of milk, has been known to the world as one of the most choice and valued articles of food.

Stimulated by the example of the Senator from Iowa, I consulted my Bible, believing there was another reference to butter that was even more significant than the one he referred to, and found that the grand old prophet Isaiah, the man who thought with God, and who, looking fifteen hundred years into the future, saw the coming of the Son of God, and exclaimed:

Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.

Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil and choose the good.

Butter and honey were the two articles of food to which the human race was then accustomed which were so manifestly perfect in their type and quality that through them could be conveyed to the world in prophecy the character of the spiritual food upon which the Son of God was to be nourished until the time when He should come into the full measure and stature of His manhood and appear as the great teacher of the world, able under all circumstances to "refuse the evil and choose the good."

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. CARMACK. The passage includes both butter and honey, and I suggest to the Senator from Vermont that he ought to put a tax on Vermont maple sugar to prevent honey from its competition.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. We have a bill pending to protect those articles. I will come to that before I get through.

Generations have been using butter; generations ever since Abraham; generations which can not be counted. The taste for butter is an inherited taste. It is one that has come to us just as naturally as any taste can come by the process of heredity through successive generations of consumers. We are a nation of butter eaters, and we demand the article in its purity.

Its color, too, for ages has been so well known that it has become a standard for comparison. The assertion has been made that butter is as often white as it is yellow. That is not true. "As red as the rose," and "as blue as the violet," and "as yellow as butter," and "as white as lard" are phrases of comparison which have been known and used beyond the recollection of every Senator present here this afternoon.

But in spite of this fact the manufacturers of oleomargarine have taken the garb in which butter has always appeared. To their product they have added enough of the substance of butter to give it the flavor and the aroma of butter, and now they claim the privilege of placing it upon the market, not for what it is, but in such a way that the people will be deceived into the purchase of the same by the belief that it is butter which they are procuring.

In a single year, out of a total of 104,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine produced, the records show that 80 per cent was sold in the States of this nation, where its sale, when colored in imitation of butter, was contrary to law, and we are also told that 75 to 90 per cent of the oleomargarine sold in those States was sold as butter. This appears over and over again in the record of the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] says that oleomargarine is not a direct competitor with butter. I think if he will follow the testimony taken by the committee he will change his opinion in respect to that matter. Mr. Flanders, who is the commissioner of agriculture of New York, says:

In our State it has never been sold, taking it generally—there may be isolated cases—cheaper than butter. For the last fifteen years, as far as I know, and I have been looking after it, I myself bought it for butter in the city of Troy and paid 22 cents a pound, and the butter right opposite was 22 cents a pound. It is sold to consumers for butter and at butter prices. There is no exception to it in the State of New York.

Mr. Blackburn, dairy and food commissioner of Ohio, says in four years time he spent \$200,000 in ferreting out frauds, and that probably 60 per cent of it was spent in the detection of frauds in the sale of oleomargarine, and he states as his deliberate judgment that 75 per cent of all the oleomargarine sold in that State was sold for butter and by deceit.

Coming over to Philadelphia—because I want to call your attention to only two or three incidents—I find the record made by Mr. Kauffman, who was conducting the prosecutions against violators of the anticolor law in that city, says there were 508 instances coming under his observation where butter was called for and presumably procured. Four hundred and fifty-nine on examination and analysis proved to be oleomargarine and only forty-nine of them proved to be butter. The secretary of agriculture of Pennsylvania said that he took a thousand samples and in each case those samples proved to be oleomargarine.

Now, coming to the city of Washington, Mr. Knight testified as follows:

I made a search of this town, in company with a Representative from Nebraska, Representative HAUGEN, of Iowa, and Representative DAHLE, of Wisconsin, and we searched every place to find a package of oleomargarine in parchment paper that had any printing on it at all, and we failed to find one in the city.

A circumstance has come to my personal knowledge which occurred in the city of Washington and indicates the way the business has been done under existing law. I was appointed last year as one of the visiting trustees of the Government Reform School located in this city, and when there upon a visit I learned that it was the custom of the officers of that school to advertise monthly for the supplies needed during the next month. They did this on one occasion. They advertised for oleomargarine. They advertised also for butter. They procured both, as they supposed. Before the month was gone they were in doubt and caused both samples to be examined at the Department of Agriculture. One was found to be oleomargarine, and that which had been bought for butter was also found to be oleomargarine, and the Government of the United States had been paying 14 cents for oleomargarine bought as oleomargarine and paying 23 cents for precisely the same article furnished under the name of butter and in answer to the contract which they had made with the grocer to furnish butter.

I have mentioned these instances just as illustrations of what has been going on all over the United States, and it can not be wondered that the people are aroused upon this subject and that they are intensely interested to have the traffic stopped when it is attempted to be carried on by a profitable system of fraud.

The fraud which has been practiced is admitted by the substitute bill, because the bill itself contains only provisions adopted to prevent deceit. All admit, on both sides of the Chamber, that legislation must be had, but the question to be determined is whether that legislation shall be controlled by the manufacturers of an article through which there has been perpetrated upon the American people a great fraud? Shall the manufacturers say what it shall be? Shall they have preserved to them the right of color through which such deceit is perpetrated?

The report of the minority of the committee, which has been laid upon our desks, contains this statement:

The alleged frauds committed in the sale of oleomargarine are not attributed to the manufacturers, upon whom the tax falls, but upon the retail dealers.

This was news to me. My investigation of the subject led me to think that the manufacturers were the parties who were responsible for the fraud. When I noticed this I remembered that the names of a few of the corporations engaged in the manufacture of oleomargarine were suggestive of guilt. Referring to them, the very first name I came across was that of a concern in Providence, R. I., which has adopted the name of the Vermont Manufacturing Company. Why have they adopted the name Vermont Manufacturing Company? It is not a Vermont institution, nor is it a Vermonter who is running it; but Vermont is famed for her butter. Was it not adopted for the purpose of creating a false impression?

I found also the following: The Capital City Dairy Company and the Union Dairy Company. I looked in the Century Dictionary and found that a dairy is "that branch of farming which is concerned with the production of milk and its conversion into butter and cheese." I also found the following: The Lakeside Creamery and the Cold Spring Creamery. I looked again, and found that a creamery was defined to be a place in which milk was "obtained from a number of producers" and "is manufactured into butter." So it goes. You may take almost every name that has been attached to the manufacture of this article and you will find that it is calculated to deceive.

Mr. President, what has been accomplished by this deception? The census taken in 1890 shows that the entire lands, buildings, and machinery of those employed in manufacturing oleomargarine were valued at only \$135,000; that the live assets of those corporations was only \$500,000, and that the number of workmen employed in the manufacture of oleomargarine, taking in workmen of every class, was less than 2,500—only, in fact, about 2,300. In the ten years which elapsed until the census of 1900, with more than two-thirds of the States composing our Union legislating against the sale of oleomargarine colored in imitation of butter, with the national law in full operation, we find there has been an increase of 100 per cent in the number of establishments for the manufacture of this article, that the capital invested in it has increased 376 per cent, that the salaries paid to employees have increased 515 per cent, and that the products have increased 318 per cent.

We find that the number of manufacturers at this time is 30; that they have 186 wholesale dealers, who are really agents when their product is sent into all these States to be disposed of contrary to law; that the retailers of this article in Chicago alone number 2,500; that the retailers in the United States number 10,000, and that through these wholesalers and retailers 80 per cent of the entire product of oleomargarine is unloaded in the manner I have described and in States having an anticolor law.

How has it been done? Are not the manufacturers responsible for this? Mr. Adams, the State dairy commissioner of Wisconsin, states that—

Right across the line in the next State are those large oleomargarine manufacturers. They are pounding at the doors of Wisconsin all the time. The agents of these big companies come into the State and go to the retailers in our State and say: "We want you to sell this oleomargarine. You can make more out of it than you can out of butter, and you can make more out of it than you can out of uncolored oleomargarine." The retailer says, "But we will get into trouble." "Oh, we will stand behind you; that is all right." But the retail dealer answers, "But you won't be here when I am prosecuted," and the agents of those people have sometimes said, "Here is a check for \$500; we will stand behind you." For years they have been coming into our State endeavoring to induce our own citizens to break down the law of our State. We do not like it. It is one continuous struggle.

My colleague [Mr. PROCTOR], in opening this discussion, called your attention to the circular of William J. Moxley, one of the largest manufacturers of oleomargarine in the United States, and that circular shows very clearly how this work has been done. In it he says: "We can give just what you want at all seasons if we know your requirements," referring to the color card which he has inclosed in the circular.

The result of these frauds, of the pushing of oleomargarine in this unfair way, was such that in Illinois a certain attorney was employed, not to prosecute those who were selling it as oleomargarine, but to prosecute those who were selling it as butter. In his circular letter to retail dealers, he says:

If you sell oleomargarine this year, rest assured that the State food commissioner and the Illinois Dairy Union will see that you are not permitted to sell it as butter.

The only threat made by him was that they should not be allowed to sell it as butter. This disposes of the assertion so often made before the committee and advanced in this debate that people bought oleomargarine for what it was instead of buying it as butter and paying a butter price for it.

Immediately after that circular went out the manufacturers gathered around the retailers in oleomargarine for their protection, and this same William J. Moxley issued a circular letter to retailers in which he says:

We strongly recommend you to pay no attention to those circulars. We have always been in a position to protect our customers from injustice and blackmailers, and will be ever at your service should you require our aid.

In that same circular he says:

Should this so-called dairy union interfere with your business in the way of prosecution as to State laws, we hereby guarantee you protection to the extent of paying all fines, costs, etc., until the color law is decided unconstitutional in the supreme court of the State of Illinois, and will further, on receiving complaint, take such action for damages as will make it unpleasant for some of those who are attempting to interfere with your and our own legitimate business.

My colleague also introduced to the attention of the Senate the circular that was sent out by Braun & Fitts, also manufacturers of oleomargarine, in response to the letter warning the dealers against selling oleomargarine as butter. Please bear that in mind. They say:

Well, now, don't you believe a word of it; there is a law against blackmailing, and we want now and here to go on record to the assertion, as an affidavit, that we shall civilly and criminally prosecute any man or party of men interfering unlawfully with the butterine business in this or any other State. We know exactly where we stand; we are properly advised on the subject, and now we make you a "fair offer."

And again they say:

Handle our goods as you always have; we in turn promise and guarantee full protection against the State law (which has been declared unconstitutional) to the extent of paying cost of prosecution, fines, and paying all costs pertaining thereto. In declaring the law unconstitutional one of the judges stated to the effect "that the butter ring were, in his opinion, liable to prosecution to recover damages done an honest industry." Fair enough, isn't it? Renew your efforts, and be assured that we will be prepared to fight any number of rounds in any kind of a legal fight to the finish. Handle our butterine and be safe.

That was the assertion and the promise and the undertaking of the manufacturers who, according to the minority report, ought not to be affected by legislation because, as it is said, the fraud is upon the part of the retailer. But here is found the great source of all the fraud. It is in the men who are making enormous profits in the manufacture of colored oleomargarine, sending out circulars to retailers advising them to violate the State laws, to ride roughshod over them, with the promise to guarantee them protection to the extent of paying all fines, costs, etc., by them incurred.

My colleague also introduced a letter from R. C. Dotson, a manufacturer of oleomargarine in Baltimore, in which he speaks of the quality and says:

"Economy"—

That, I think, is the name of the brand which he was producing—

"Economy" is fancy. "Perfection" is the happy medium of grades, good enough for fancy trade. "Clover Creamery"—

Another innocent name—

In producing this fancy grade of butterine scientific research has been exhausted. "Clover Creamery" is the best on earth, by actual test; made by the most approved scientific methods; possessing the very purity and flavor of the clover fields; more perfect uniformity than any other butterine or butter. The cow herself could not tell it.

[Laughter.]

Why was he sending out such a statement unless the great public were the victims and he was inspiring the man to whom he was writing to violate the law of his State to impose upon his customers and to give them a compound the base of which is procured from tallow and from lard, and which contains only a sufficient amount of butter to give it its flavor and to make it in any degree palatable?

What has been the effect of the manufacturers' action? We find that years ago here in this city there was the firm of Wilkins & Co., so testimony produced before the Senate committee says, composed of Walter E. Wilkins, who is now the president of the Standard Butterine Company, doing business in this city, and his brother, Mr. Joseph Wilkins. The records show that Joseph Wilkins and Howard Butler, his clerk, were detected in doing what? They were detected in the railroad yards of Philadelphia removing the marks of identification and the revenue

stamps from a carload of oleomargarine which was to be sent to Washington as pure butter. The very thing that the retailer under the substitute bill can do they were detected in doing. They were indicted, and they were convicted. Mr. Wilkins was sentenced to imprisonment. He made an application to President McKinley for a pardon. President McKinley referred it to the Attorney-General of the United States for his opinion. Attorney-General Griggs, in returning the petition, said:

The petitioners, Joseph Wilkins and Howard Butler, were convicted of fraudulently removing labels from packages containing oleomargarine in violation of the act of August 2, 1896, and were sentenced on March 17, 1898, as to Wilkins, to imprisonment for six months and to pay a fine of \$1,500 and costs, and as to Butler, to imprisonment for four months and to pay a fine of \$500 and costs.

I will not read the entire record; but the Attorney-General, among other things, says:

The records of the office of internal revenue show that Wilkins has been a persistent violator of the oleomargarine laws, and that prior to the present prosecution he has escaped punishment by means of money payments in compromise. The records show that on December 14, 1893, Wilkins filed a proposition to pay \$2,100 and costs in compromise of all liabilities, civil and criminal, incurred in the First district of Illinois, for selling oleomargarine as butter, and by violating various sections of the law relating to wholesale dealers in oleomargarine. This offer was accepted December 26, 1893.

About a year later—

April 4, 1895, Wilkins again filed an offer of compromise, agreeing to pay \$2,000 in settlement of his liabilities for alleged frauds under the oleomargarine law committed in connection with a firm in West Virginia. This offer was also accepted.

A year later, April 2, 1896, Wilkins was indicted with another in the District of Columbia for selling unstamped oleomargarine. On June 20, 1896, he offered to pay \$1,000 in compromise, but this being rejected the case went to trial and the accused was acquitted. There are three separate indictments against him pending now in the District of Columbia for selling oleomargarine in unstamped packages. These indictments were found January 4, 1897.

The Attorney-General further says:

The offense of which the petitioners are now convicted was committed December 20, 1896, two days after the verdict of acquittal in the trial in the District of Columbia.

This man was so hardened in conscience and so beset with a purpose to violate the law that within two days after that acquittal he had committed a fresh offense.

The petitioners were discovered by a revenue agent in the act of scraping off the stamps, marks, and brands from packages of oleomargarine.

The Attorney-General further says:

In connection with the present case an offer to pay \$8,000 and costs in compromise was made, but rejected February 23, 1898, and thereupon the case went to trial, with the result above stated.

It is obvious that the business in which Wilkins was engaged must have been one of great profit; otherwise he could not have afforded to make the very large payments in compromise which he did make or offered to make.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the Senator allow me to ask him to whom the money was paid?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. To the Government of the United States, as I understand it.

Mr. HAWLEY. Where was the money to go?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I do not know. The last offer to compromise by the payment of \$8,000 by Wilkins was declined. If anybody thinks that manufacturers are not guilty of perpetrating a fraud upon the public when their agents can offer to compromise their offenses by paying such enormous sums, I shall be glad to have him read the whole opinion of the Attorney-General.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. I rose more particularly to reply to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY]. I was commissioner at the time, and the money was deposited in the hands of the commissioner to be turned over to the Government in case it was accepted in compromise. I believe the Senator from Connecticut asked where the money was to go. The offer was refused, and a prosecution followed, and he was put in the penitentiary. We turned the money back.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Now, Mr. President, there is another interesting chapter in the history of this man Wilkins, so convicted. After he was indicted by the Federal grand jury and his business broken up, and while, in fact, as I understand it, this conviction was hanging over him, he was employed by the firm of Braun & Fitts, of Chicago, whose circular I have referred to, as a director to their salesmen, and I have only to add that the record which I have read indicates that he must have been a most accomplished director of those who were to go out and perpetuate the methods which he had adopted in defrauding the public, but which for a season he was prevented from following.

Added to all this effort on the part of the manufacturers to force their product upon the market has been the further temptation on the part of the retailers to make enormous profits. The Mr. W. P. Wilkins who is the president of the butterine factory

in this city says in the prospectus which he issued when that factory was in process of construction that the cost of producing oleomargarine, including the tax of 2 cents a pound, would be \$8.92 per 100 pounds. Then he adds:

The above cost, when deducted from the market price of \$13 per 100 pounds, shows a net profit of \$4.08.

Then he adds:

It will be seen that even if the company produced only the 400,000 pounds per month for which it now has definite orders, a net profit of over \$16,320 a month, or \$195,840 a year, would be assured.

A most astonishing statement; and yet it is contained in the prospectus. He adds:

This would mean 8 per cent on the preferred stock of the company, or 20 per cent of the entire capitalization.

Governor Hoard, when he came before the Committee on Agriculture, made this statement:

What does oleomargarine cost? Armour & Co., of Chicago, testified before a Federal district court of New York that with a 2-cent Federal tax added the cost was less than 7 cents a pound. If it was uncolored the poor could buy it for 10 cents, or at most 12 cents a pound. Yet I saw the colored article selling in Ashland, Wis., to the poor for 28 cents a pound.

It was the Mr. Wilkins who is the president of the Standard Butterine Company who wrote the other letter produced by my colleague in which the offer was made to furnish butterine, "A substitute for butter that can not be detected."

Now, who makes the profit in this business? Referring to the other circular letter introduced in evidence, and we find that the Capital City Dairy Company, of Columbus, Ohio, were corresponding with their retailers and offering their variety of oleomargarine, known as "Purity," at 14 cents a pound, and advising the retailer that it could be sold at 20 cents, making a profit to the retailer of 6 cents a pound; that they would sell the "Buckeye" brand at 17 cents a pound, and that it could be easily sold for 25 cents a pound, a profit of 8 cents; and that the "Pride" variety could be sold at 18 cents a pound and retailed at 30, or at a profit of 12 cents a pound.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] says that Secretary Gage testified that the temptation would be too small under the substitute bill to lead any retailer to remove the labels and sell colored oleomargarine as butter; but if the profit upon it is as large as indicated, you can see at a glance that both temptation and opportunity still remain to remove the stamps and the wrappers from the packages and to pack the substance in tubs and sell it for butter, as was done by Wilkins with the carload of oleomargarine in Philadelphia.

Now, the question suggests itself whether manufacturers supporting the substitute bill shall through its provisions secure to the retailer an opportunity to defraud the public and impose upon them an article deceptive in character.

The real object they seek is well expressed by the Supreme Court of the United States in what is known as the Plumley case, to which I have already referred. In that case it appeared that oleomargarine in its natural condition is of a "light yellowish color" and that the article sold by the accused was artificially colored "in imitation of yellow butter." The court says:

Now, the real object of coloring oleomargarine so as to make it look like genuine butter is that it may appear to be what it is not, and thus induce unwary purchasers, who do not closely scrutinize the label upon the package in which it is contained, to buy it as and for butter produced from unadulterated milk, or cream from such milk. The suggestion that oleomargarine is artificially colored so as to render it more palatable and attractive can only mean that customers are deluded by such coloration into believing that they are getting genuine butter. If anyone thinks that oleomargarine, not artificially colored so as to cause it to look like butter, is as palatable or as wholesome for purposes of food as pure butter, he is, as already observed, at liberty under the statute of Massachusetts to manufacture it in that State or to sell it there in such manner as to inform the customer of its real character. He is only forbidden to practice, in such matters, a fraud upon the general public. The statute seeks to suppress false pretenses and to promote fair dealing in the sale of an article of food. It compels the sale of oleomargarine for what it really is, by preventing its sale for what it is not.

But the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY], after quoting the opinion of Professor Schweitzer, to the effect that, if carefully made, physiological experiments reveal no difference whatever in the palatability and digestibility between butterine and butter, made the inquiry, "If these things be true, what is the harm if a man intending to buy butter shall buy butterine by fraudulent imposition of his dealer?"

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Yes, sir.

Mr. MONEY. I hope the Senator from Vermont will allow me to state what I did say.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. MONEY. I said, if you can not tell the difference by the taste, by the color, by the smell, or by its digestibility, and no harm is done, what is the odds? And I say that again.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I will answer the Senator from Mississippi in the language of Governor Hoard, of Wisconsin, who has given this matter great attention. He says:

The normal heat of the human stomach is 98°. Butter melts at 92°, 6° below the heat of the stomach, passes into pancreatic emulsion, and digestion. Nature designed this fat in its raw state for food.

Oleomargarine melts at the varying temperature of 102° to 108°, a temperature no healthful stomach ever attains. As a consequence this unnatural foreign fat must be expelled by sheer gastric action and force.

Butter fat is found in the milk of all mammals. It is chemically and physically unlike any other fat in existence. It was designed by nature for the food and sustenance of infant offspring, having the most delicate of all digestion. Because of this most evident purpose and provision of nature butter forms a healthful and important article of food in milk, cream, and in its separated state.

Mr. MONEY. Will the Senator allow me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. MONEY. I do not want to trespass on the courtesy or the time of the Senator, but I will ask him if Governor Hoard is an expert chemist, or doctor, or anything else, so that he is able to form a judgment about these things, or does he get his information elsewhere; and if so, from whom? The testimony is overwhelming, I say, almost unanimously so, of experts, chemists, and others, that oleomargarine is just as wholesome and as nutritious and as digestible as butter.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator will refer to the testimony taken before the committee, he will see that there was some testimony on the other side.

Mr. MONEY. There was one witness, and there may have been two, who so testified; but I say the overwhelming preponderance of testimony is the other way.

Mr. SPOONER. You argue that one thing in favor of oleomargarine is that it keeps longer. It does, in the stomach. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONEY. It keeps longer anywhere.

If the Senator from Vermont will permit me right here, I wish to say that I have now on my desk a letter from a chemist, who was one of the three appointed by the legislature of New York to make a chemical analysis of this food twenty years ago, when the subject was first agitated, and he reported that oleomargarine was absolutely wholesome and nutritious and a very valuable contribution to the list of foods; and I have now that oleomargarine which he examined twenty years ago, and it is still good. You could not say that of butter.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President—

Mr. MONEY. I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. That is not necessary.

Governor Hoard has for twenty years been investigating the subject of dairy products. He has made an exhaustive study of them. I do not know of any man in America, perhaps, who is better informed regarding them than Governor Hoard.

Now, answering the question in another way, suppose that we carry the same inquiry to the article of milk as a food. I have an ingenious neighbor who, years ago, when people were making filled cheese, invented a machine by which melted lard could be so combined with skimmed milk that it would enter into the curd and furnish the fat for filled cheese. Suppose oleomargarine is permitted, without discouragement, to be colored like butter, why should not the dealer in milk have the right to color his mixture of skimmed milk and lard in semblance of Jersey milk and impose it upon his customers? What would prevent the restaurateur from serving it to us as "half and half" when we go for our daily lunch? We could not tell the difference. If the imposition is right in one instance, why not in the other?

The truth is, Mr. President, that the American people are getting sick of being humbugged, whether it is by imitation butter, whether it is by adulterated milk, whether it is by adulterated maple sugar, or whether it is by honey that is made of glucose. We have a committee of this Senate that is investigating this very question, a committee that sat in all the principal cities a year or two ago taking testimony, and a committee that will, I hope, very soon be able to present a measure here that shall be so effective in its operations that the American people will be protected in their rights, at least in securing that which is pure and wholesome and good as an article of food.

Coming again to the question of color, and whether the makers of oleomargarine have the right to use this color, as they have done, in foisting upon the public a spurious article, I beg to refer to a case recently decided in the Supreme Court. I think the opinion was handed down on the 6th of January of this year. It was the case of the Dairy Company v. Ohio. In it the court used this language:

The supreme court of Ohio, however, having before it the evidence introduced upon the issues of fact made in the pleadings, held that oleomargarine was an article which might easily be manufactured so as to be hurtful, and thus result in fraud upon and injury to the public, and that the inhibition of

the use of coloring matter in oleomargarine was a reasonable police regulation tending to insure the public against fraud and injury. The purpose of the legislature in permitting the use of harmless coloring matter in butter and requiring that oleomargarine be sold in its natural state was declared not to be for the purpose of discriminating in favor of butter, but to provide a ready means by which the public might know that an article offered for sale was butter and not oleomargarine.

No one can improve either upon the doctrine or the language of the court which rendered that opinion.

Again, what has been the result of this system of fraud inaugurated by the manufacturers for the deceit of the public? We find that the assistant food commissioner of Illinois says that fully 75 per cent of all the oleomargarine that is retailed in that State is retailed as butter; in Ohio the assistant food commissioner says that 75 per cent of the oleomargarine sold there is sold as butter; in Wisconsin the food commissioner tells us that 90 per cent of all the oleomargarine sold in that State is sold as butter; and in New York the assistant commissioner of agriculture tells us that oleomargarine was universally sold as butter, so far as he knew, without exception.

Again, Mr. President, as showing who opposed this measure before the Committee of the Senate, if any man will read this book [exhibiting] or look through it he will see that Judge Springer is the leading attorney and perhaps the strongest advocate for the substitute bill of anyone who appeared before the body, and he appeared, as the record shows, for the National Live Stock Association of the United States. He stated that the association consisted of 126 other live-stock associations, a majority of all. He said that it had a capital of more than \$600,000,000. Armed with such credentials as those, Judge Springer comes before this committee. But what does Judge Springer say when he gets there? I challenge any man to read his statement or argument without becoming convinced that the great interest that Judge Springer is advocating is the interest of the manufacturers of oleomargarine. There is hardly an argument presented by anybody in favor of the substitute bill that has not first been presented by Judge Springer, and he is a very able man.

But now in the discussion of the question in this body the honorable Senator from Kansas [Mr. HARRIS] has lifted the cloud and he has let in a flood of sunshine upon the conditions. In a speech made the other morning in the Senate—a speech that was so fair and candid and strong and convincing that I wish every member of this body might have listened to it—the Senator from Kansas used this language:

As to the interests of the cattlemen being hurt in any possible way I do not for a moment concern myself. The evidence is absolutely conclusive that, even if we should absolutely stop the consumption of oleomargarine in this country, the effect upon the cattle industry of the country would be absolutely inappreciable.

As has been shown, we slaughter about 11,000,000 head of cattle in this country, and the total amount of the value of the product of oleomargarine which is utilized in this country is only about \$2,750,000. So that there will be from 25 to 30 cents per steer, and every cattleman knows that that would be absolutely inappreciable.

The Senator from Kansas further said:

The great packing interests control, as I have said, the price of cattle in this country, and—I do not say it with any desire to reflect upon them—considering the opportunities that they have had, they have acted with wonderful fairness and moderation. They have the power, they are members of all the great live-stock exchanges of the country, and they control practically all the great cattle associations everywhere. The commission men are practically all subordinated to the wishes and interests of the great packing houses. Cattle are sent to the great stock yards of this country to be sold, and the seller meets but four or five buyers, representing these great establishments. Every commission merchant knows that unless he is on good terms with the great packing houses his business is liable to suffer, and consequently it is an easy matter for the live-stock exchanges to pass any kind of resolution that may be supposed to be in the interest of these great establishments.

And these are the establishments that turn out the oleo oil that is made into oleomargarine. Now, I want to read further from the speech of the Senator from Kansas. He said:

The cattlemen of the West are a great big-hearted, broad-souled set of men; they live in the open; their lungs are filled with pure air, and their veins are filled with good, warm, red blood. I denounce and deny as a cattleman that the owners of the great cattle ranges and farms of the country are in any way whatever in sympathy with this false pretense that is being made use of by a part only of the manufacturers and dealers in oleomargarine that is offered for sale throughout the country.

That disposes of that whole question. It is a full explanation of the attitude of the cattlemen who were represented by Judge Springer. To-day the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON] has introduced a memorial from the cattlemen of his State, in which they make the charge against the proprietors of the creameries of this country that the measure we are supporting is the measure of the creamery proprietors, and that they constitute a great trust controlling that particular industry of the country. Let us see how that is. I find from the statement that has been furnished us that the whole amount of butter produced in this country in 1899 was 1,500,000,000 pounds, and only 300,000,000 pounds were made in creameries; in other words, the butter industry of the country was so far controlled by individual producers that

only 20 per cent of all that manufactured came from the creameries of the country, which, it is claimed, have formed a trust.

It is an interesting fact in connection with the discussion of process butter that only three-fourths of 1 per cent of all the butter in the United States is of the process variety.

Mr. President, I want to ask another question. Has the general public made any demand for the substitute bill, or is the general public in favor of the bill now pending, reported by the committee? The nearest approach to anything that has indicated to me that the general public wants the substitute bill was in the question that was put by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. HARRIS], when he was speaking the other day, when the Senator from Texas said:

Mr. CULBERSON. I call the attention of the Senator from Kansas to the testimony of Commissioner of Internal Revenue Wilson before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last year, in which he said that the demand that oleomargarine be colored came from the purchasers of oleomargarine and the retail dealers—the users of the article, the plain laboring people of the country. I call the attention of the Senator to that statement.

Well, I have looked at the testimony given by Commissioner Wilson, which will be found on page 750 of this book, in which he says:

The incentive which brings about this violation of the law is not limited, in my judgment, simply to the desire for gain upon the part of the retail dealer who is selling oleomargarine. There are other sides to the question. The private family, the boarding-house proprietor, the hotel proprietor do not want to carry home oleomargarine marked as such. We encounter a great deal of that feeling.

He does not say a word about the laboring classes. He does not say a word about the plain people. He says that while some private families dislike to carry home oleomargarine, it is evident that it is the boarding-house and hotel keepers who make that complaint.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the argument of the Senator from Mississippi, made in support of the rights of the wage-earners of the United States. My suggestion, by way of reply, would be, first, if the bill we have under consideration becomes a law, it will reduce the tax on oleomargarine uncolored, and it will give people an opportunity to purchase it in any State in this Union as oleomargarine, and at a price 14 cents per pound less than it could otherwise have been gotten for.

It is said that a reproach attaches to oleomargarine. The time was when a reproach did attach to it, and rightfully enough, because it was a vile compound as manufactured by some in the beginning; but under the operation of the law of 1886 the superintendence over its manufacture has been such that a certain class of men have undoubtedly been driven from the business, and the agitation in Congress has been such as to advertise oleomargarine in all of its component parts.

The general public to-day is educated as to what the materials are that enter into its manufacture, how they are prepared, the cleanly methods which have been adopted, and all of those things which would tend to make oleomargarine respectable in the market and tend to make it something to be desired by those who do not wish to pay a higher price for a finer article of food, so that if this bill is passed these wage-earners are to be provided for; they can have it. Added to that, it has been proven during this investigation that any person may purchase oleomargarine in its natural color, and when he has taken it home he may color it to any tint of yellow he sees fit and present it on his family table in appearance just as beautiful as the finest creamery butter can be made. Under this bill they have the full right to do that; but the people who have not the right to do that are the retailers; the people who have not the right to do that are the hotel keepers; the people who have not the right to do that are the restaurant keepers. They are the men who are swindling all of us when we patronize them; but the wage-earner, who wants the cheaper article because he can not afford the other, can buy it, and he has the right to color it in any way he sees fit so as to make it beautiful to the eye and attractive to the sense.

There were witnesses before the committee who said that the manufacture of oleomargarine was an honest industry, that this bill was calculated to strike down that industry, and they wanted protection for American labor. Mr. McNamee, of the Chicago Federation of Labor, I believe, was one of them. They—the labor element of the country—have demanded the exclusion of the Chinese, and probably every man in the Senate agrees with them that the treaty regulations with China should be fully carried out in the exclusion of Chinese laborers; but when we come to compare the number of people who are employed in these industries, have they the right to demand that the oleomargarine industry should be nourished and propelled by legislation for the protection of American labor? I respectfully invite attention to the fact that in 1890 there were only 2,350 persons employed in the manufacture of oleomargarine, and by the same census there were more than 17,000—yes, 18,000—men who were professional dairymen employed in the production of butter and cheese, and when we came to the farm laborers, who are also largely em-

ployed in dairying, there were more than 5,000,000 of them. So that there is no argument in that suggestion.

The trouble is that they misapprehend what the object of this bill is; and it strikes me that they have misapprehended it by misrepresentations which have been made to them, possibly by the manufacturers of this product. Attention has been called, for instance, to the action of the Chicago Federation of Labor where they say that—

Efforts are being attempted by contemplated legislation at Washington to destroy the manufacture and sale of butterine, thereby displacing large numbers of the industrial element—

when everybody knows that the object of this bill is not to destroy the production of oleomargarine, but to legalize it and to encourage it as oleomargarine, the only purpose being to stamp it out when it becomes a fraud upon the public.

The painters and decorators of Cleveland, Ohio, also passed a resolution, in which they say:

It is an outrage, in order to gratify the people who make butter, that we should have to go without it and pay two prices for butter which we are compelled by law to eat.

That it is an outrage "that we should be obliged to go without oleomargarine and pay two prices for butter which we are compelled by law to eat." This clearly shows they understood that was the issue; that this bill was to stamp out the production of oleomargarine, rather than to regulate its manufacture and to encourage its sale as oleomargarine.

Another of these gentlemen referred to is Patrick Dolan, president of the United Mine Workers' Union. He says:

Don't want to be deprived of the ability to purchase this wholesome article of food.

He did not know that under this bill he would have the right to purchase it, and purchase it everywhere under the protection of the law, and to purchase it at a price that would not carry with it the price of butter.

Now, if there is anybody else than those I have mentioned who demand the adoption of the substitute bill as against the bill reported by the committee, I do not know who it is.

I have already called attention, Mr. President, to the fact that there are 10,000 retailers of oleomargarine in the United States. If the general public, to whom they have been selling oleomargarine as butter, want to have that practice continued, why have not these 10,000 retailers, with all the opportunity at their command, gathered petitions of their customers and sent them in here as others have sent in petitions? I do not know that a single petition from them has been presented. If there have been any they have escaped my attention. The petitions of that character which have been presented have been so limited in number that no one has paid any attention to them, and yet, if the general public wanted oleomargarine sold in the colored state, as it has been, surely these 10,000 retailers would have been employed as the agents of the manufacturers and those petitions would have come in here thicker than hail.

There is another side to this question, Mr. President. One gentleman appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who was a manufacturer of oleomargarine. I refer to Mr. Tillinghast, of Providence, R. I., evidently a gentleman of great candor, a man who frankly said that oleomargarine was imitation butter, because, while it had for its base oleo oil and lard, it had also in it a sufficient quantity of butter to give it the aroma and flavor of butter, and had color in it to make it appear to be butter itself. Mr. Tillinghast is perfectly satisfied that this bill is going to pass. He appeared before the committee to make some suggestions about the tax that should be paid by the retailers, and he made the frank confession that he believed that oleomargarine in its natural state, without color, could be sold. He thinks that the people will overcome their prejudice against it.

It is—

He says—

sold to some extent already. I am one of those who believe that oleomargarine now, having been used for a quarter of a century and more, that people, some people at least, having learned that it is a wholesome and cheap article, will continue to use it.

I believe, too, that the American workingman is so intelligent, is so much of a reader and so much of an investigator that, with the discussion that has been going on here, he will have the right conception of what oleomargarine is, and that he will buy it, whatever the color of it may be, whenever he wants a cheaper article than butter.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the junior Senator from Vermont yield to the senior Senator from Vermont?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. PROCTOR. I desire to inquire of my colleague if Mr. Tillinghast, the president of a Vermont manufactory manufacturing oleomargarine, did not testify that he was making and selling oleomargarine uncolored?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. He testified that he was selling it in Massachusetts and selling it in Connecticut where they have anticolor laws. He evidently sees a great future before him as a manufacturer of oleomargarine with this bill passed, when he can sell it strictly in accordance with law; and with the quality which he gives to his manufacture, make a market which can only be made when people have faith in the product which is placed before them.

Mr. President, I have spoken longer than I intended, but it is evident to me that, in order to regulate this matter once and for all, we must go to the root of it, and require that when butter is sold, it shall be sold as butter, and when oleomargarine is sold, it shall be sold as oleomargarine.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I should like to make a suggestion to the Senator from Vermont before he leaves the question of color and the sale of uncolored oleomargarine. On page 11 of the hearings before the Senate committee, I wish to suggest to the Senator the testimony of Mr. Springer who stated that—

The question is one of relative importance only. I do not wish to be understood as saying that in Denmark the consumption amounted to 15 pounds per capita by reason of the fact that the consumers were permitted to color it themselves. I stated that they were permitted to color it, and that that fact may have contributed to that large consumption. I have no fears whatever of conditions generally which will permit the consumption of 15 pounds per capita per annum of oleomargarine in the United States.

It shows that in Denmark the sale is very much greater than it is in the United States, because it is sold uncolored.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I am very much obliged to the Senator for calling my attention to that statement. It had escaped me entirely as I was carrying on this discussion.

There never was a time in the history of our Government that we were not in need of revenue. We have just taken off the war taxes. I do not know how much larger revenue we will derive under this bill than is received under the present law, but probably not so much as would be supposed, because the new act will probably operate to discourage the manufacture of the colored article and the tax upon the uncolored article will be reduced from 2 cents a pound to one-fourth of 1 cent a pound.

I was very much struck the other day when the Senator from Wisconsin was discussing this bill with the point he made that public policy demands that this article be sold for just precisely what it is. I sent for the statutes of Canada, and I find that they provide that "food shall be deemed to be adulterated within the meaning of this act if any substance has been mixed with it, so as to reduce or lower or injuriously affect its quality or strength;" again, "if any inferior or cheaper substance has been substituted, wholly or in part, for the article;" again, "if it is an imitation of or is sold under the name of another article."

The result of that statute, we are informed by Governor Hoard in his argument, is this:

Compare the policy pursued by the United States with that of Canada. The Dominion government guards the purity and honesty of her dairy products to the extent of absolute prohibition of any adulteration or counterfeiting of the same. As a result, her export of cheese to England alone has grown in twenty years from \$3,000,000 to \$20,000,000, while ours has declined nearly the same amount because we did not place the strong hand of the law on the adulterated product—filled cheese—until we had lost the confidence of the foreign consumer.

The Dominion of Canada has taken from us nearly all of our once magnificent export trade in dairy products. Canada absolutely prohibits the making of counterfeit butter or cheese.

It seems to me, in view of all the facts that have been produced in this discussion, a manifest duty is laid upon us to take away the temptation for fraud which exists under present conditions. I believe we can best do this by placing upon the medium of that fraud a burden too great to be profitably borne. The bill reported by the committee is equitable in all its features. While it imposes a heavy rate of taxation upon oleomargarine colored in imitation of butter it also reduces the taxation upon oleomargarine offered for sale in its natural color, thus affording the purchaser of that article an opportunity to secure the same at a price 14 cents per pound less than he otherwise could do. By the adoption of this measure we protect the manufacturer of oleomargarine in all of his rights; we protect a time-honored industry in its rights; added to this, we protect the great army of consumers, who, without such legislation, are defenseless.

Mr. President, we represent here to-day 45 States. Thirty-two of them have adopted laws which prohibit the sale of oleomargarine within their borders when colored in imitation of butter. The legislatures of these States represent 80 per cent of the people of the United States. It has been impossible for the State authorities to enforce their statutes owing to the determined purpose of many of the manufacturers of oleomargarine to impose their goods upon the public in the garb of and as butter. The States are in a helpless condition. They appeal to this body to so adjust its system of taxation that incidentally protection may be given to the great army of dairymen in the United States against a fraud upon their industry, and the still greater army of consumers of

dairy products. Shall we not respond by the adoption of this measure?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I intend to vote for this bill. I can give my reasons as clearly in ten minutes as I could in a ten-hour speech. I am not able to enthuse myself as our farmer Senators from Wisconsin and Iowa over the subject of protection to the cow. My associations with that quadruped have not been such as to bear fruits of enthusiastic admiration. I believed in my earlier days that she was rather a necessary evil, and that firmly fixed impression still clings to me.

But I do feel if there is any being on the face of this earth who is justly entitled to protection it is the man who owns and is compelled to attend to the desires and thwart the inclinations of that animal.

The opportunities to enact legislation directly beneficial to the product of the great army of agriculturists are so limited that whenever one is offered to protect any of their goods the duty to extend legislative aid becomes a most stringent moral obligation upon Congress.

The agriculturist is of the one class who always sells his product for just what it is. It may not always be the best, but it always leaves his hands with its true stamp. His butter may not always be the finest, but he sells his butter for butter, his lard for lard, and if it is poor, if it is fit for axle grease only, he only gets axle-grease prices for it. The man who renovates bad butter is seldom ever the farmer.

He is not asking very much; just simple, everyday honesty. His class constitutes about one-half of the people of the United States, and if he sells his products honestly and fairly for just what they are to the other half he is entitled by the law of commercial integrity to receive honest goods from them in return.

He is entitled to secure sirup when he buys sirup, and not glucose. He is entitled to have his coffee coffee, and not chicory, and legislation should not stop with the prohibition of colored oleomargarine alone. A pure-food bill—one that shall protect him in his sale as well as in his purchases—should also become a law.

The price of much of his product being fixed by foreign demand, where he is brought into close competition with all the cheap labor of all the balance of the world, while he does his part to protect all other industries from like competition, every principle of national justice and reciprocal integrity demands that he have an honest, fair field of competition in our home markets free from counterfeit and gross deceit.

He has a right to eliminate from that field of consumption this conglomerated mass of greases and deodorized rot that, under the head of "Finest Elgin butter" or other falsehood, comes into competition with his honest labors.

I regret that it has been found necessary to employ a somewhat deceptive bill to meet an insidious fraud, but the man who practices the fraud of selling a low grade of hog fat with a little suet for butter can not be heard to complain of the character of the weapon that is used against him. Selling his own articles under a false brand, flying them under false colors, he is not in a position to complain that the blow aimed at his product is struck from behind a shield with an erroneous or false title.

Everyone knows that this bill is intended to tax colored oleomargarine out of existence, although it is under the guise of a revenue bill which has never been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. I was unable to follow the fine distinction drawn by the Senator from Massachusetts the other day, when, as I understood him, he denied the constitutional right to tax the colored article out of existence except upon the theory that it operated to assist the Government in the collection of a tax upon the uncolored. My understanding of the law is that once concede the right to tax any article or product, you concede the right to confiscate the very article itself to answer that tax, and the extent of the tax—the limit of amount—is always a legislative and not a judicial question, and may be levied for the very purpose of annihilation.

But if there is any other way whereby we can reach the evil legislated against; if there is any way by which we can so compel the branding of this article so that it can not come on any table without a card of identification, then I should prefer that other method.

The most strenuous objectors to this bill have shown no way by which this object can be accomplished other than by the character of legislation proposed. All other attempted remedies have failed. All their stress of argument is laid upon what they call an infringement of a right to make their goods presentable and palatable by coloring.

It is evident, however, that while this objection may enter into their protest, the great, the one important reason for the objection is that the coloring enables them to perpetuate a fraud.

The demand for their goods depends upon the amount consumed in the household, in the boarding houses, in the ranches, and in

the logging camps, and the amount so consumed depends almost wholly on the extent and the ability to counterfeit.

If this is true, then the colored article should be prohibited. If it is not true, then this law would be no hardship on the manufacturers and dealers in colored oleomargarine. If they wish to avoid this tax, let them cease to counterfeit butter. Let them first make a good, wholesome food out of wholesome oils and fats—one that will receive the approval of eminent chemists and food specialists—and then let that article, with its high indorsement, work its way into favor on its own merits, just as all other necessary manufactured food products have been compelled to do.

This, Mr. President, it seems to me, is all that they in right can ask of the legislators, and if that right is granted them they are in no position whatever to complain. There is nothing whatever in this bill which prevents them from selling their article for just exactly what it is, and no hardship is perpetrated upon them by requiring them so to do. These, Mr. President, briefly are my reasons in support of this bill.

Mr. HEITFELD obtained the floor.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. HEITFELD. Certainly.

Mr. PROCTOR. Does the Senator from Idaho rise to speak on the pending bill?

Mr. HEITFELD. I do.

Mr. PROCTOR. Possibly on account of the lateness of the hour the Senator would prefer to defer his remarks until to-morrow.

Mr. HEITFELD. I would prefer to do so, with the understanding that I retain the floor.

Mr. PROCTOR. Certainly. I will give notice, then, that after the routine morning business to-morrow I will ask to have this bill taken up, and I shall expect the Senator from Idaho to resume the floor at that time.

Mr. HEITFELD. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. PROCTOR. It will probably be about half past 12 o'clock.

Mr. HEITFELD. Very well.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. PROCTOR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 1, 1902, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate March 31, 1902.*

##### MARSHAL.

William D. Fossett, of Oklahoma, to be United States marshal for the Territory of Oklahoma, vice Canada H. Thompson, resigned.

##### COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Edward Fry, of New Jersey, to be assistant collector of customs at Jersey City, N. J., in the district of New York, in the State of New York, to succeed Samuel D. Dickinson, resigned.

##### PENSION AGENT.

Augustus J. Hoitt, of Massachusetts, to be pension agent at Boston, Mass., to take effect April 27, 1902, at expiration of present term. (Reappointment.)

##### REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Charles H. Titus, of Topeka, Kans., to be register of the land office at Topeka, Kans., vice George W. Fisher, term expired.

##### RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

J. G. Wood, of Topeka, Kans., to be receiver of public moneys at Topeka, Kans., vice Rudolph B. Welch, term expired.

DeWitt C. Tufts, of North Dakota, to be receiver of public moneys at Fargo, N. Dak., his term having expired. (Reappointment.)

##### MEDICAL INSPECTOR IN THE NAVY.

Edward Kershner, to be a medical inspector in the Navy, on the retired list, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress (Private—No. 184) approved March 20, 1902.

##### APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Christopher C. Wolcott, to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 28th day of February, 1901.

Frank O. Maxson, to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 28th day of February, 1901.

Robert E. Peary, to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant-commander, from the 5th day of January, 1901.

George Mackay, to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant-commander, from the 28th day of February, 1901.

Frank T. Chambers, to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 5th day of January, 1901.

Charles W. Parks, to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 28th day of February, 1901.

John F. Hanscom, to be a naval constructor in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 3d day of March, 1899.

Joseph H. Linnard, to be a naval constructor in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 5th day of August, 1899.

Joseph J. Woodward, to be a naval constructor in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 19th day of April, 1900.

David W. Taylor, to be a naval constructor in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 4th day of March, 1901.

Albert W. Stahl and William J. Baxter, to be naval constructors in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 3d day of March, 1899.

Washington L. Capps, to be a naval constructor in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 5th day of August, 1899.

Lloyd Bankson, to be a naval constructor in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 19th day of April, 1900.

John G. Tawresey, to be a naval constructor in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 4th day of March, 1901.

John D. Beuret, Joseph E. McDonald, and Homer L. Ferguson, to be assistant naval constructors in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 1st day of July, 1900.

Daniel C. Nutting, jr., and Holden A. Evans, to be assistant naval constructors in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 29th day of January, 1901.

William P. Robert and Daniel H. Cox, to be assistant naval constructors in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 12th day of July, 1901.

Thomas G. Roberts and Lawrence S. Adams, to be assistant naval constructors in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 20th day of July, 1901.

Thomas A. Gill, to be a chaplain in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 9th day of June, 1901.

Walter G. Isaacs, to be a chaplain in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 9th day of June, 1901.

The following-named chaplains to have the rank of lieutenant from the 3d day of March, 1899:

William G. Cassard.

Arthur O. Sykes.

William T. Helms.

Frederic C. Brown.

Curtis H. Dickens.

Omenzo G. Dodge, to be a professor of mathematics in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 17th day of December, 1899.

Stimson J. Brown, to be a professor of mathematics in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 25th day of August, 1900.

Henry M. Paul, to be a professor of mathematics in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 25th day of August, 1900.

Edward K. Rawson, to be a professor of mathematics, in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 25th day of November, 1900.

Aaron N. Skinner, to be a professor of mathematics in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 25th day of November, 1900.

Philip R. Alger, to be a professor of mathematics in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 22d day of May, 1899.

#### PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named pay officers to be paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant-commander, from the 3d day of March, 1899:

Charles W. Littlefield.

Arthur Peterson.

William W. Galt.

John R. Martin, to be a paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant-commander, from the 22d day of November, 1899.

The following-named pay officers to be paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant-commander, from the 8th day of December, 1899:

Charles M. Ray.

Mitchell C. McDonald.

Eustace B. Rogers.

The following-named pay officers to be paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant-commander, from the 22d day of September, 1901:

Leeds C. Kerr.

Richard T. M. Ball.

Charles S. Williams.

Thomas J. Cowie.

The following-named pay officers to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 20th day of May, 1901:

Hugh R. Insley.  
George M. Stackhouse.  
Grey Skipwith.  
Trevor W. Leutze.  
McGill R. Goldsborough.  
David V. Chadwick.  
Eugene C. Tobey.  
Arthur H. Cathcart.

The following-named medical officers to be surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant-commander, from the 3d day of March, 1899, viz:

David O. Lewis.  
Howard E. Ames.  
Frank Anderson.  
Phillips A. Lovering.  
William R. Du Bose.  
Charles T. Hibbett.  
Nelson H. Drake.  
Henry G. Beyer.  
John M. Steele.  
James E. Gardner.  
Millard H. Crawford.  
George P. Lumsden.  
Emlyn H. Marsteller.  
James C. Byrnes.  
Samuel H. Griffith.

To be surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant-commander, from the 8th day of December, 1899:

Averley C. H. Russell.  
Clement Biddle.

Henry T. Percy, to be a surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant-commander, from the 30th day of August, 1900.

To be surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant-commander, from the 22d day of September, 1901:

James D. Gatewood.  
Oliver Diehl.

The following-named medical officers to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 3d day of March, 1899, viz:

William C. Braisted.  
Sheldon G. Evans.  
Adrian R. Alfred.  
John E. Page.  
Middleton S. Guest.  
Joseph A. Guthrie.  
Charles M. De Valin.  
Charles P. Bagg.  
Carl D. Brownell.  
Henry D. Wilson.

The following-named medical officers to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 1st day of July, 1899, viz:

Lewis Morris.  
John M. Moore.  
Brownlee R. Ward.  
Edward M. Shipp.  
Charles E. Riggs.

To be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 1st day of July, 1900:

James F. Leys.  
Frank C. Cook.

To be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 26th day of December, 1900:

Ammen Farenholt.  
Charles P. Kindleberger.

To be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 29th day of January, 1901:

Arthur W. Dunbar.  
Theodore W. Richards.  
Reginald K. Smith.

To be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 1st day of July, 1901:

Jacob C. Rosenbleuth.  
Moulton K. Johnson.

The following-named medical officers to be assistant surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 7th day of June, 1901, viz:

Thomas McC. Lippitt.  
Barton L. Wright.  
Ralph W. Plummer.  
Henry E. Odell.  
James S. Taylor.

Joseph A. Murphy.  
John T. Kennedy.  
Karl Ohnesorg.  
Charles N. Fiske.

#### APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

##### *Artillery Corps.*

Jacob M. Coward, of New Jersey, late captain, Fourth New Jersey Volunteers, to be first lieutenant, September 23, 1901, to fill an original vacancy.

Edward L. Glasgow, of Kansas, late captain, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers, to be first lieutenant, September 23, 1901, to fill an original vacancy.

Robert B. McBride, of Georgia, late captain, Third United States Volunteer Infantry, to be first lieutenant, September 23, 1901, to fill an original vacancy.

#### POSTMASTERS.

John B. Leffingwell, to be postmaster at Braidentown, in the county of Manatee and State of Florida. Office became Presidential January 1, 1902.

James R. Young, to be postmaster at Ada, in the Chickasaw Nation, Ind. T. Office becomes Presidential April 1, 1902.

Millard F. Campbell, to be postmaster at Wilburton, in the Choctaw Nation, Ind. T. Office becomes Presidential April 1, 1902.

Harvey G. Lowrance, to be postmaster at Thayer, in the county of Neosho and State of Kansas. Office becomes Presidential April 1, 1902.

Charles L. Hanson, to be postmaster at Berea, in the county of Madison and State of Kentucky. Office becomes Presidential January 1, 1902.

John C. Stoughton, to be postmaster at Geddes, in the county of Charles Mix and State of South Dakota. Office becomes Presidential April 1, 1902.

Warner S. Carr, to be postmaster at Lake Nebagamon, late Lake Nebagemain, in the county of Douglas and State of Wisconsin. Office becomes Presidential April 1, 1902.

Kennedy B. Summerfield, to be postmaster at Santa Monica, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California, in place of George B. Dexter. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1902.

Willis S. Gardner, to be postmaster at Clinton, in the county of Clinton and State of Iowa, in place of Willis S. Gardner. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1902.

Russel W. Branson, to be postmaster at Cherokee, in the county of Crawford and State of Kansas, in place of Russel W. Branson. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

William T. McElroy, to be postmaster at Humboldt, in the county of Allen and State of Kansas, in place of William T. McElroy. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1902.

Thomas B. Leland, to be postmaster at Water Valley, in the county of Yalobusha and State of Mississippi, in place of Thomas B. Leland. Incumbent's commission expired July 19, 1901.

Mathew J. Orr, to be postmaster at Osceola, in the county of St. Clair and State of Missouri, in place of Mathew J. Orr. Incumbent's commission expired June 11, 1901.

Robert Z. Bennett, to be postmaster at Beresford, in the county of Union and State of South Dakota, in place of Robert Z. Bennett. Incumbent's commission expires March 31, 1902.

Charles J. Hostrasser, to be postmaster at Hearne, in the county of Robertson and State of Texas, in place of Charles J. Hostrasser. Incumbent's commission expires March 31, 1902.

Thomas J. Darling, to be postmaster at Temple, in the county of Bell and State of Texas, in place of Thomas J. Darling. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1902.

Dozier Anderson, to be postmaster at Tupelo, in the county of Lee and State of Mississippi, in place of James W. Elliott, removed.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 31, 1902.*

##### CONSUL.

William E. Alger, of Massachusetts, to be consul of the United States at Puerto Cortez, Honduras.

##### MARSHAL.

William D. Fossett, of Oklahoma, to be United States marshal for the Territory of Oklahoma.

#### APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

##### TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS.

##### *Infantry Arm.*

Archibald G. Hutchinson, of Missouri, to be second lieutenant, February 2, 1901.

*Artillery Corps.*

Lawrence Carter Crawford, at large, to be second lieutenant, March 18, 1902.

George H. Terrell, of Texas, to be second lieutenant, March 18, 1902.

William Scott Wood, of Virginia, to be second lieutenant, March 18, 1902.

## TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT.

William W. Chance, of the District of Columbia, late captain and signal officer, United States Volunteers, to be first lieutenant, September 23, 1901.

## INDIAN AGENT.

George D. Corson, of San Carlos, Ariz., to be agent for the Indians of the San Carlos Agency, in Arizona.

## SURVEYORS OF CUSTOMS.

Perry M. Lytle, of Pennsylvania, to be surveyor of customs in the district of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania.

Mahlon M. Garland, of Pennsylvania, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Pittsburg, in the State of Pennsylvania.

## COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Nevada N. Stranahan, of New York, to be collector of customs for the district of New York, in the State of New York.

## POSTMASTERS.

Annie H. Leaf, to be postmaster at Fort Washington, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania.

William S. Linton, to be postmaster at Saginaw, in the county of Saginaw and State of Michigan.

William E. Ward, to be postmaster at Ridgeville, in the county of Randolph and State of Indiana.

James F. Brenaman, to be postmaster at Alexandria, in the county of Madison and State of Indiana.

I. Warner Arthur, to be postmaster at Bryn Mawr, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania.

William E. Brown, to be postmaster at Linesville, in the county of Crawford and State of Pennsylvania.

James M. Hundley, to be postmaster at Summitville, in the county of Madison and State of Indiana.

Addison Eppehimer, to be postmaster at Royersford, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania.

James W. Bartlett, to be postmaster at Doylestown, in the county of Bucks and State of Pennsylvania.

Solomon S. Ketcham, to be postmaster at Overbrook, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *March 31, 1902.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of Saturday's proceedings was read and approved.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. LANHAM, by unanimous consent, obtained leave of absence indefinitely, on account of important business.

## SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the sundry civil appropriation bill; and pending that motion I ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENTON] whether he is prepared now to suggest a time for closing general debate?

Mr. BENTON. Not exactly. About two hours and a half have been asked for on this side, so far as I know. I do not know what arrangements the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE], the leading member of the minority of the committee, made before he left the city. I suggest that the gentleman from Illinois allow the debate to run along for a while without any arrangement, and it may be that before night we can agree to close the debate this afternoon.

Mr. CANNON. I have not had any application for time for general debate on this side. I think I can get through myself in thirty minutes. What does the gentleman say to closing the general debate with the end of to-day's session? If the debate gives out we can, of course, commence the consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule earlier.

Mr. BENTON. I would not like to agree to that until I see whether other members, that I do not now know about, have been promised time by the gentleman from Arkansas. So far as I am personally concerned, I will say that I would be willing to close the general debate at the close of to-day's session. I suggest, however, that for the present the debate run along without any arrangement.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am desirous of passing this bill, not with lightning speed, but as rapidly as may be practicable from a business standpoint. I have no desire to prevent reasonable debate, but I trust that later we may agree that the debate close to-day.

Mr. BENTON. I prefer to ask the gentleman to let the debate run along without limitation until the close of the day.

Mr. CANNON. I have accepted the suggestion of the gentleman upon that point.

The SPEAKER. The question is now the motion of the gentleman from Illinois, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13123) known as the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. LAWRENCE in the chair, and proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13123) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill may be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose in presenting this bill to the committee to take much time. So far as I am concerned, I am content with saying that the bill has been carefully prepared by the Committee on Appropriations, is believed to provide liberally for the public service, and I should be glad to have it considered at this stage of the session in good faith directly upon the merits of the bill. With the large latitude that has been given to general debate and under the five-minute rule heretofore, I suggest that we have come to a time in the session when we could well devote ourselves to the matter in hand.

The bill is pretty thoroughly analyzed by the report, being report No. 1260. If gentlemen now or hereafter desire to have the bill in a nutshell, the report thoroughly gives it. The estimates, original and supplemental, for this bill amount in round numbers to \$61,779,000. The bill recommends \$49,323,000, or, in other words, below the estimates the bill recommends \$12,455,000. The bill for the current year, for purposes of comparison, carried nearly \$62,000,000. The present bill is a reduction over the bill for the current year of twelve million and a half of dollars. Your committee in the consideration and reporting of this bill, while it has striven to and I believe has recommended liberally for the public service, has made its recommendations from the standpoint of the new conditions that surround the Treasury, in light of the tax-reduction bill of last year covering, as is estimated, \$41,000,000, and in light of the bill now pending in conference to remove the remainder of the war taxation, estimated at \$70,000,000, the two together, if this legislation is enacted, and I will assume that it is to be enacted, because it is morally certain that it will be, making a reduction of revenues of \$111,000,000.

I am heartily glad of it, because it leaves sufficient revenue, in my judgment, under the law when thus amended to carry on liberally the public service. I am not here to talk to any considerable extent about the undesirability of too much revenue. There is only one thing worse than too much revenue, and that is too little revenue. I think when the law is amended, as it is soon to be, that we will strike the happy medium, gathering great blocks of revenue for great blocks of service, and that we will be armed when the law is thus amended with weapons of defense against those who would exploit the Treasury of the United States for too much of appropriation. The report explains in detail the various reductions.

One matter that explains considerable of the reduction is that last year one very large item—three millions and a half—was carried by this bill for the public debt that the United States was bound to pay of the Hawaiian Islands, and so on, with other various matters, some of that kind and others representing real economies in the public service. There are many things that we considered, that were estimated for, that are not in this bill. One that I will call attention to was a small estimate of \$5,000 for the purpose of making plans for a National Museum building. Gentlemen understand the necessity for that building. That something ought to be done in the early future is patent. Your Committee on Appropriations tried to place a limitation on the plans. We called in the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institute, and we examined various public officials to see if we could not make that limitation.

After consideration they did not believe that a building could be constructed for less than \$4,000,000. Your committee is of opinion that we ought not to commence plans upon a \$4,000,000

basis. In our judgment we can build for one million and a half to two millions of dollars a building that will answer the National Museum for the next quarter of a century, and when those who have such matters in charge come to the ideas that your committee has touching this matter it will be time enough to grant an appropriation to begin the plans. There was much of pressure, as there is before many committees, to take into consideration extensive erections of public buildings and plans for the same in the District of Columbia; much of pressure for the improvement of parks in the District of Columbia. Your committee went quite fully into this whole subject. That some additional buildings are required in the city of Washington is patent; that something of improvement is required for the public parks in the city of Washington is evident, but after a full investigation substantially your committee have not recommended that action be taken at this time.

There is a great industry here in the city of Washington, and there is but one industry here, and that is to exploit the public treasury for improvements in the city of Washington without cost to the local population. I do not say this unkindly. It is but natural, and history repeating itself as to all capitals of great nations. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to talk a great while about this bill, but I am inclined to accept the conditions of the Committee of the Whole, as noted, that it would, perhaps, be best to discuss this bill under the five-minute rule. We have made one recommendation, however, for an improvement to one of the parks of the city—that is, to begin an improvement at Potomac Park, \$70,000. Gentlemen, understand that some years ago, by law, the Potomac Flats, which have been reclaimed in large part, were dedicated as a public park, and are now a part of the system. It will cost a great deal of money to properly improve this great park, and we ought to go at it slowly, but we ought to make progress. After full investigation, your committee recommends \$70,000 for the purpose of continuing a road along the river bank in the vicinity of the national monument, for the purpose of building a wall about where the public bathing beach is now situated, and for the removal of that bathing site to barges or elsewhere other than it is now.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if he has yet discussed the recommendation of the committee as to the Yellowstone Park?

Mr. CANNON. No.

Mr. BENTON. At the proper time I should like a statement about that.

Mr. CANNON. If my friend will remind me a little later on, I will come to that.

Your committee might perhaps well have made additional recommendations, but in the present condition we thought best to rest with this one recommendation.

Great plans have been made for the extension of the park system in the District of Columbia. We already have a great park system, many hundreds of little parks scattered all through the city, and then we have the Zoo. We have Rock Creek Park, and have had it for many years. The future is well cared for and well assured from the standpoint of the Government service in the District of Columbia and for the convenience of its inhabitants and for the welfare and pleasure of all the people. But this system of parks being reserved, we can go slowly. The Almighty did much in the Rock Creek Park. If you just let it alone, making a few roads, which are gradually being constructed, you can not improve much upon nature, and it will not be necessary for a decade to make much of an expenditure in that splendid park.

There is a park commission proposition that has never been adopted by Congress, and, so far as I am concerned, I am inclined to say never will be adopted by my vote. It was not a self-appointed commission, but a commission appointed by the coordinate branch of Congress under a resolution. That commission made their plans, splendid and magnificent. When the improvement is complete, it is to cost \$200,000,000. As I understand it, it involves the condemning of all the territory between the Mall and Pennsylvania avenue, and the payment of the damages from the public Treasury, and a great many other matters that in my judgment ought not to be enacted.

Mr. BENTON. Is it not a matter of fact that this property was once the property of the Government and that they are proposing to buy it back?

Mr. CANNON. I am not advised as to that. That may be true; but it is now the property of individuals. I will not enter upon a discussion of its merits. It may come later in connection with this bill or some other bill. My position and that of your committee, I think without dissent, as I understand it, is about as follows: That for construction of public buildings to carry on the public business in the city of Washington we stand quite ready to cooperate, and recommend all apt appropriation as speedily as the public service requires and the public revenues will allow, with due regard for the public service elsewhere in the United States.

The second proposition is to beautify the city without regard to the public service and to make it a beauty spot in the United States. As to that great project the position of your committee is that we shall go just so fast in beautifying the city of Washington as the people of the city of Washington are willing to go and no faster, paying half the expenses thereof by taxation. That is a very good check upon that kind of improvements. Therefore, in the improvement of this park, \$70,000, which but commences it, we provide that one-half of that sum shall be paid from the revenues of the District. And so as to all the great park systems of the District of Columbia, your committee are thoroughly of opinion that they ought to be and must be improved, one-half from the Treasury of the United States and the other half by local taxation.

There is one other matter that I want to call to the attention of the committee. There is a great cry for a hall of records in the District. There is a great cry for the erection of a palace of justice, a new State Department, and so on, and so on. Some of these works might well be commenced, but they ought to be commenced with care to make them fairly agree with the improvements that have been made in the District on the one hand and to shut off extravagance upon the other.

Much that is said about a hall of records might well be unsaid if the Government of the United States paid enough attention to the records of the United States to preserve the records that ought to be preserved and to destroy those that are of no account.

I will illustrate what I mean. Your committee made an investigation touching the records in the Census Office, and we found there in a rented building substantially fireproof the population schedules from the First Census down to the present. They came asking an appropriation of \$15,000 to bind the population schedules of the census of 1890. They have done it for several years. We have turned it down for several years, and on this investigation we find now of those old, useless population schedules, commencing with the year 1790, 400 tons, kept in a rented building, heated and lighted, with watchmen and laborers and a force of clerks. They are of no manner of use on earth in my judgment except to furnish a reason for paying rent to somebody to house them and to afford employment to the employees who have charge of them. You know what a population schedule is. That is the schedule that the enumerator makes out when he visits you all over the country: How many in the family? Married? How many children? Ages, residence, where born, and so forth, and so forth. Well, now, those schedules come in and are tabulated, and the tabulation is published, and after that, in my judgment, they are of no account.

When the question of destroying them was presented, those having them in charge threw up their hands in holy horror. "Oh," you say, "but what use are they?" "Oh, somebody may want to know who lived at Winsted, in Connecticut, in 1790, and what was his name and whether he was married." "Well, but it is not evidence." "Well, but sometimes we get inquiries." They are not evidence. Now, then, I undertake to say that 400 tons of population schedules, some of which has been taken care of for a century and all of which are being cared for now by a force of clerks, laborer, watchman, light, heat, and rent ought to be destroyed. And there are lots of records of no more account than these. If we had the departments intelligently cleared of useless records, in my judgment there is plenty of space to accommodate the public service of the United States in the city of Washington.

Another matter that your committee investigated. On the sundry civil law for the current year the following provision is found:

To enable the Architect of the Capitol to prepare and submit to Congress at its next session plans, specifications, and estimates of cost for reconstructing and extending in a fireproof manner the central portion of the Capitol building; the renovation and decoration of the Rotunda; also for the construction of a fireproof building adjacent to the grounds of the Capitol building, to be used for offices, storage and power plant purposes connected with the Capitol building, \$1,500, to be immediately available.

The Architect of the Capitol took this question up. Gentlemen may be aware that the Capitol never was completed; that on the east part the original plans, specifications, and drawings were all made long ago. There was to be a wing east corresponding with the wing west. The Dome itself extends over the wall on the east. It would add to the architectural effect, would give more room, that is needed, in the Capitol. It would permanently house the Supreme Court, with consultation rooms, ample quarters for attorneys, ample quarters for a library, and would almost, in addition, double for committee rooms space that was added in the western extension of the Capitol. Now, the investigation shows that to complete the Capitol would cost \$2,500,000; to renovate the rotunda \$275,000.

In addition to that, under this provision of the law the Architect of the Capitol has ascertained that to construct a tunnel from the Capitol somewhere to land that is south of us, or southeast or southwest, near by the Capitol grounds, and to complete a building with 400 rooms in it, in a style of architecture that would

comport fairly well with the surroundings of the Capitol and Library of Congress, and construct a tunnel from the Capitol to such building, constructing such a building with a great basement that would hold all the documents and that would hold in addition the heating apparatus of the Capitol, move it all out and your lighting apparatus into such a building, giving additional room in the Capitol for committee rooms, removing the condition that we have from musty documents, that the construction of such a building would cost, in round numbers, \$4,000,000, and that, with the completion of the Capitol, would cost \$6,775,000.

In the judgment of your committee this is one of the earliest improvements that ought to be made in the public buildings. On the Senate side Senators have their office rooms in the Maltby Building or the Capitol. On the House side there is a very general complaint upon the part of members that if they have places in which to transact their business that they have either to utilize quarters at their houses and hotels or that they have got to go and lease them. This scheme, if adopted, would enable each Representative to have a comfortable room near by the Capitol for office purposes. [Applause.]

Now, I call attention to this fact because I want the House to bear in mind that after investigation for a hall of records, a new State Department, a new Department of Justice, and various other schemes that are talked about ought to wait until this improvement is authorized and begun before these are authorized. This, in my judgment, is the first thing to do. Now, then, I want to say further, that your committee did not see proper to report this provision, but have suggested that I call attention of the House to it for the reason that in the present condition, with this reduction of a great block of the revenue, that probably it would be well enough to wait until we could reasonably forecast what the revenues will be before we authorize or recommend the construction—until the next session of Congress.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Was there any investigation by the committee as to whether it was feasible or not to add more stories to the Capitol building, and thereby provide rooms for members for work?

Mr. CANNON. Your committee was thoroughly satisfied, from taking counsel with the architects in part—and you know they do not entirely agree—but the best opinions seems to be that it would not be practicable to do more than to expend \$2,000,000 in continuing to complete the Capitol, for the eastern extension, according to the original plan. We therefore consider that it would be much better to get rid of the heating and lighting apparatus and construct a building just across from the public grounds here.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Did the committee make any inquiry as to the feasibility of erecting stories on top of this building?

Mr. CANNON. The consensus of opinion seemed to be against it.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. The gentleman's suggestion as to the construction of a building to accommodate members of Congress has been postponed, has it?

Mr. CANNON. We did not report any provision for the same for the reason that with the universal hunger for promotion of the public service—and I speak of it respectfully, because I am one of the hungry ones, along with other gentlemen—that under all the conditions, with what is in front of us at this session of Congress, we thought best to call the attention of the House to the various propositions that would probably be pressed upon us in connection with public buildings in the District, and to express our opinion that, everything considered, in our judgment, that matter had better go over until the succeeding sessions of Congress.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I trust the gentleman from Illinois will pardon me for the interruption, but I feel a great interest in the question. If members of Congress would express their wishes about it now, does the gentleman believe that the committee would recommend it?

Mr. CANNON. It would be in the power of the House, if they want to commence it at once, to do so.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. It seems to me it is more important to preserve the health of members of Congress than it is to preserve the old, dusty records.

Mr. CANNON. I think so, and I am calling it to the attention of the House, so that if we do not commence it now—whether we commence it now or at the next session this is the first great improvement along the line of public buildings that ought to be undertaken in Washington, because, in the judgment of the committee, it is the most needed.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. It seems to me that the suggestion that the committee makes will meet with the hearty concurrence of all the members, not only as to the mere suggestion, but that they would be in favor of taking it up and going on with it.

Mr. CANNON. Well, that is the object of my calling the attention of the House to the matter.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I desire to supplement what the gentleman from Alabama has just said, and I think it will meet with the unanimous approval of the members of the House. This is the first construction that we ought to begin. I hope the gentleman's committee, under his able and economical administration, will see to it that the much-needed building is started early in its progress.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, there is one other matter, answering my colleague from Missouri [Mr. BENTON], that I want to call attention to, and that is the improvement of Yellowstone Park. Gentlemen understand about it. For twenty-five years, substantially, we have been appropriating money for the improvement of Yellowstone Park. We have been paying current expenses and adding a little improvement year by year, until there is a condition of that park that satisfies your committee, after very thorough inquiry, ought to be met. All necessary roads can be constructed, all necessary bridges can be constructed, all the roads can be surfaced so as to get rid of the dust and get a permanent, firm road, including the making of the necessary roads across the forest reservation to the south of the park and bridges across the forest reservation east of the park, open a road from Great Falls to Yanceys, and otherwise finish these improvements for about \$750,000. It will require three years to do it. If done, it will be under the charge of the engineers of the Army; in fact, these improvements for a number of years have been under their charge, and the park has been policed for a number of years by a troop of cavalry.

Your committee was of opinion, after a thorough investigation, that this work ought to be completed, and then it can be maintained annually thereafter for about \$30,000. So we appropriated \$250,000 and authorized contracts for the two succeeding years of \$250,000 each, with a view of completion of this work.

Now, I will not multiply words, but it seems to me I have fairly covered the ground in connection with the recommendations in this bill, and when we come to consider it under the five-minute rule I will stand quite ready to answer any suggestion that can be urged or answer any questions to the best of my ability.

How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Thirty-eight minutes.

Mr. LLOYD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question. I notice the statement that the committee has reduced the expenditure of the Geological Survey \$80,000. What is the purpose of that reduction?

Mr. CANNON. That is apparent and not actual. On page 2 of the report the gentleman will see that it says:

This reduction is apparent, not actual, \$60,000 having already been appropriated for investigation of the mining resources of Alaska and \$11,200 for rent of building being transferred to the legislative act, leaving, in fact, a net increase of \$1,000 in the total appropriations for the Survey, which amount is given as an increase in the appropriation from \$3,000 to \$4,000 for expenses of transmitting documents through the Smithsonian exchange.

Mr. LLOYD. I notice the remarks in the report. I note in the estimate made by the Department amounts to \$1,024,207, while the committee have appropriated \$880,000. What was it that they applied for and what is it that the committee have not included in the appropriation?

Mr. CANNON. They wanted an increase all along the line. There was a provision on the bill for the current year that directed the Secretary to make specific estimates for his whole force; and in the making of those estimates there was somewhat of an increase. On fuller investigation we concluded it was not practicable for the Secretary to estimate or the committee to recommend specifically for the scientific corps, because, in our judgment, it is a live service, and the Bureau had better be left to this administration employing scientists from time to time for necessary work, and then letting them go out of employment when not required. That explains part of the matter. Another part is the publication of maps. My recollection is that for this they wanted \$100,000; we gave them \$70,000.

I want to say, touching this service, that it is a great service, a growing service. It has got about legs enough to crawl itself. [Laughter.] It has a wonderfully bright head and a wonderfully meritorious one I will frankly say, in my judgment.

Mr. LLOYD. I concur in what the gentleman says on that point.

Mr. CANNON. It grows, you know, like a green bay tree. I think we have fairly well cared for it. I trust it may always remain as efficient as it is now and may always keep out of the rut in which much of the public service is apt, and to contract the disease of dry rot.

Mr. LLOYD. Is it not true that a considerable sum was asked as an additional appropriation for topographical survey?

Mr. CANNON. Fifty thousand dollars more was asked for that purpose.

Mr. LLOYD. Was any necessity shown for that \$50,000 additional?

Mr. CANNON. That was for additional work, as we understood. The truth is there would be a demand for \$1,000,000, if we would give it. They would take the amount and would do the work. But this service has grown quite rapidly; and after investigation your committee is of opinion that the amount recommended is sufficient. My friend knows that we must leave something for future generations to do.

Mr. LLOYD. Was there anything else for extension of the service? The gentleman sees the point I am trying to reach. What was it which the committee appropriated that would extend the service? The gentleman says that \$50,000 was for additional expenditure in topography. I want to get at the amount they desired to expend which would expand the service.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I think there was an estimate for an additional party to go to Alaska.

Mr. LLOYD. You have already provided for that?

Mr. CANNON. We have already three parties—

Mr. LLOYD. You have already provided for that, have you not?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; but they want another one.

Mr. LLOYD. How much more money?

Mr. CANNON. I do not recollect; I think \$20,000. It seemed to us that this matter might wait. This whole question can come up, however, under the five-minute rule.

Mr. LLOYD. All right.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I was not able to hear the whole statement of the gentleman from Illinois, because I was called out of the Hall. Therefore he will allow me to ask, Does this bill carry an appropriation for improvements in this District—for what is termed "beautifying Washington?"

Mr. CANNON. It carries the usual appropriation for the park system.

Mr. RUCKER. No extension—no increased amount?

Mr. CANNON. There is an increase of \$70,000 for improvements on the Potomac Flats—the making of a roadway along the bank of the river adjacent to the Monument and extending of the wall where the bathing establishment is now.

Mr. RUCKER. This bill does not carry any appropriation for making these extensive improvements that we have been reading about in the papers?

Mr. CANNON. The parking system?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. Nay, nay.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman spoke about the construction of a building for offices. That is practically useful, I suppose—needed?

Mr. CANNON. I believe the committee is of that opinion. I most certainly am.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman considers that much more necessary than the appropriation of large sums of money for the purpose of beautifying the city of Washington?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, I am satisfied that the first thing that ought to be done toward extending the public buildings in the city of Washington is to complete this Capitol according to the original design and make the improvements indicated.

Mr. RUCKER. Let me ask the gentleman another question. I believe the appropriations made for the improvement of this city must be borne one-half by the General Government and one-half by the city of Washington?

Mr. CANNON. Well, that is not entirely so. We are trying to extend that principle—the principle of half and half.

Mr. RUCKER. Are there any appropriations here for public improvements—I do not mean Government improvements, but improvements of the city or District—of which the District does not pay half?

Mr. CANNON. We have upon this bill in many instances, especially in extending and improving the parks, succeeded in getting the appropriations made on the half-and-half principle. In regard to this improvement on the Potomac Flats we provide for payment half and half.

Mr. RUCKER. Does the gentleman believe that every improvement of that nature ought to be borne by the District?

Mr. CANNON. I do.

Mr. RUCKER. And none of them paid for in whole by the Government? Now, if the gentleman will kindly answer me, if he can. This half which is paid by the city or the District, of course, is raised by local taxation?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. There has been a good deal of discussion in the newspapers about the taxation of personal property here. Will the gentleman advise me as to whether personal property is taxed here?

Mr. CANNON. Practically, I understand not.

Mr. RUCKER. Then, does not the gentleman believe that before we appropriate another dollar for expenses, one-half of which

the city ought to pay, that the city ought to be required to tax personal property?

Mr. CANNON. I will say to my friend that the newspapers say that the District Committees that have charge of legislation are considering that subject, and it has been announced that provisions to be recommended are about ready. Your Committee on Appropriations has delayed the preparation of its appropriation bill for the purpose of seeing whether or not such legislation would be enacted, and as one member of that committee I am not willing to provide for expenditures for improvements of the District proper except as the District contributes its quota.

Mr. RUCKER. Its half.

Mr. CANNON. And I trust before this bill is enacted—I mean the District bill that is to come later—that legislation under the lead of the District Committee of the House and of the District Committee of the Senate will provide for an increase of revenue. I trust that will be the case.

Mr. RUCKER. There is a proposition pending to make a loan of ten or fifteen millions of dollars to the District. Does that come before the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. CANNON. No, that would not. That would involve legislation of which the District Committee of the House would have jurisdiction.

Mr. RUCKER. And not yours.

Mr. CANNON. In my judgment it is not necessary to make a loan. In my judgment if there was a fair assessment of the real estate of the District of Columbia that the revenues would be increased a million of dollars, say, or more, by reason of that fair assessment. Then if there was a fair assessment of the personal property of the District, of the capital stock of the various corporations, and the choses in action, substantially like such property is taxed in the States, in my judgment it would yield at least a million and a half of dollars of revenue. That would make two millions and a half, and two millions and a half increase, with a like amount added from the national Treasury, will do all the work that is desirable to be done in the District of Columbia, in my judgment, and as fast as it ought to be done without the borrowing of one cent.

Mr. RUCKER. Then it is the best policy of the Government to impose taxes on all the personalty and money, stock, bond, choses in action and force the District in that way to raise a part and the Government pay its part, rather than to loan.

Mr. CANNON. I have no doubt that the property of the District ought to be taxed for the benefit of the District revenues as it is taxed elsewhere.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman doubtless has seen in the papers that taxation of personal property might compel some rich gentlemen to leave the District.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I do not know. It seems to me that if they should insist on going on that account I would fracture the Constitution for the purpose of hoisting a flag and hiring a band as they depart. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUCKER. I am very glad to hear the gentleman say that. I agree with him. One other proposition. If they do not go, the newspapers say they might be forced to commit perjury in order to hide their property. The newspapers here in Washington say that.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I hardly think that is correct.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman understands me—

Mr. CANNON. I do not believe that any great block of people would commit perjury. Once in a while, for a great many centuries, individuals have lied, and I think where a man would tell a lie for gain he would probably swear to it, but I do not think that is the rule.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman understands me. I do not charge it, I merely say I saw it in the newspapers. I see that argument advanced that gentlemen here would commit perjury rather than pay taxes.

Mr. CANNON. Well, we want to be lenient in our minds with our friends in the District. I do not mean that we want to fail to enact legislation, but they have just the same kind of people here that they have in every other capital, namely, people who desire to get the most they can at the expense of all of the people and bear as little burden at their own expense as possible.

Mr. RUCKER. I fully agree with what the gentleman has said about leniency to the people of the District of Columbia, but I think, also, that we ought to be fair with our people at home, and if in doing that we force some rich men to leave the city of Washington I would join the gentleman in hoisting the flag and hiring the band, and if they stay and violate the law let them be dealt with like any other man who violates the law.

Mr. CANNON. I do not believe that many gentlemen of wealth—I do not believe that any gentleman of wealth—would leave the District of Columbia under just taxation; and now, to be candid, for fear I may have been misunderstood, I am very glad that any American citizen who sees proper to come to Washington to live should come. And it is no crime, in my eyes, for a

man to be rich. I would stop just when I made him contribute his share, according to his property, for the public service.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Is there any law authorizing the taxation of personal assets now in the District of Columbia?

Mr. CANNON. None that is enforced, as I understand it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Why is it not enforced? What is the trouble?

Mr. CANNON. Well, I think probably that the machinery, as I understand it, is not provided for its enforcement, as is claimed.

Mr. GROSVENOR. There was a cog left out of the machinery.

Mr. CANNON. Probably a cog left out.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. A cog removed; not left out.

Mr. CANNON. A cog removed, says my colleague from Massachusetts, and I accept that statement, because he knows more about it than I do.

Mr. GROSVENOR. They have just ceased to collect.

Mr. CANNON. But it is our business to put the cog back.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes; I agree with you. They took that cog out, and then kept entirely quiet and did not appeal to Congress to put the cog back; just went quietly along, and then finally said there was not any law authorizing the assessment of personal property, and asking us to tax our constituents the full half of all the expense, while they kept, perhaps, a full half off from the tax duplicate. That is about the way of it, as I understand.

Mr. CANNON. Well, it is so alleged, and I think very likely that is correct.

Mr. GROSVENOR. And in the meantime the District of Columbia has become a haven of rest for those who dislike to pay taxes elsewhere; and they drift here and obtain a nominal residence, without paying any taxes here, and reporting themselves as nonresidents of the State from which they came.

Mr. CANNON. I fear that is the case; I do not know, but I suspect that is the case in many instances.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Do not you think it would be a good cure for that to refuse to appropriate money until some system of taxation is enforced here that will equalize those assessed upon our own people?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, as Congress is the common council for the District, a better cure is that, knowing the evil, we apply the remedy.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Very well.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I have endeavored as best I could to hear the colloquy between the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENTON] and the gentleman from Illinois a few moments ago, and I assume that the chairman of the committee [Mr. CANNON] stated that it was his desire as a member of the committee to see that the District of Columbia paid one-half of the expenses for the beautifying of the parks of the District, and that that was the principle involved in the appropriation contemplated for the improvement of the Potomac Flats beyond the Monument. I should like to ask the gentleman whether there is any improvement, of the general scope of the improvement of the Potomac Flats embodied in this bill, wherein that principle of having one-half of the expense paid by the District of Columbia is omitted?

Mr. CANNON. No; I think it is not omitted.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. May I ask the gentleman the amount of the appropriation beyond the Monument?

Mr. CANNON. Seventy thousand dollars.

Now, I will yield ten minutes of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY], who wishes to leave the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Illinois has but four minutes remaining.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana ask to be recognized?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I ask to be recognized in my own time. I intend to use about ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. If no one desires to address the committee in opposition, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Indiana. If anyone desires to address the committee in opposition, he will be recognized.

Mr. BENTON. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] is a member of the committee and of the subcommittee. I am in charge of this side, and I have no objection to the gentleman from Indiana using such time as he desires. I intended to make a short statement myself, but I can do it afterwards. I think the gentleman is entitled to some time in his own right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair always endeavors to alternate in recognizing gentlemen.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I will state to the Chairman that if there is anyone who desires to be heard now, I will wait. I only want to use ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I do not often consume the time of this House by speaking, but I am so deeply interested

in one item in this bill and in the legislation that I hope will speedily follow, that I feel it is my duty to urge upon Congress that we act and act promptly. I refer to the item of \$200,000 to enforce the Chinese-exclusion law.

You ask why appropriate this money when this law expires by limitation May 5.

My answer is that the bill reported to this House from the Committee on Foreign Affairs or the one now pending in the Senate must be passed and become law before May 5 or this Congress will go into history as committing the greatest crime that has been committed by lack of legislation in many years. I urge that there be no longer delay, but that this legislation be enacted at once. Then the Department will find waiting the money now on hand from our last appropriation and \$200,000 more that we appropriate by this bill, so that the safeguards that have been heretofore adopted and such other safeguards as are necessary to enforce the law and prevent Chinamen getting into this country may be carried into effect.

When the gentleman with smooth tongue, who wants cheap labor in order that his profits may be increased, urges that Chinese labor will do no harm, do not listen to him for a moment, but push him aside and tell him you stand for that great mass of American citizens who are earnestly striving to uphold the standard for the American wage-earner, and for his cottage home, for good clothing and food for his wife and children, and you have no use for the man who wants to degrade him and ruin his home and family by placing him in competition with Chinese labor. I believe in protection of American industries, but, my countryman, how much more important it is to protect our American wage-earner who has had so much to do with making this the greatest nation on earth. Then let us delay no longer. We have before us the bill reported from the committee of our own body.

No one can fail to see how well drawn it is, or how intelligently and conscientiously the original author of the bill and the committee have labored over it, and they deserve and will receive for their splendid work the thanks of their colleagues in both Houses of Congress, and not less the hearty thanks of the great public which has such a vital interest in the success of this all-important measure. If it is not perfect it can be amended.

I shall vote for this bill with the greatest pleasure, and I wish to do all that I can to promote its passage, believing as I do that it is not only for the interests of the American public—that is far too cold and colorless a phrase—but that it is absolutely essential for the continuance of our American institutions and civilization.

The original bill, as it came from the hands of the distinguished member from California, was strong and praiseworthy. The amendments have merely made it still stronger and more praiseworthy. I especially welcome the amendment which provides for keeping Chinese immigrants out of our insular possessions as well as out of our mainland. It has been repeatedly thrown in the teeth of the dominant party that it was proposing to allow Chinese labor to be made use of extensively in the Philippine and Hawaiian islands, so as to enable American manufacturers and capitalists to go to those islands and produce goods there by Chinese labor cheaper than we can produce them at home with American labor, and thus allow some of our own employers and producers to cut under our own prices and undermine the precious structure of American industry. This amendment fully meets and disproves all such allegations, and its necessity, on general principles, is evident. I am very glad it has been incorporated in the bill.

The bill is carefully drawn so as to do no injustice to anybody. No true American wishes to do injustice to any foreigner, be he European, African, or Asiatic. The bill amply provides for the rights and conveniences of Chinese entitled to enter or reside in this country—the Chinese laborers registered as residents, or the Chinese teachers, students, merchants, and travelers who may wish to enter and remain temporarily in the United States. There can be no complaint against the bill on this score. The gentlemen who have appeared before the committee in opposition to the bill, the gentlemen who are so desirous of increasing their profits in trading with China, say that they are not pleading the cause of coolie labor, that they do not object to the prohibition of Chinese labor in this country. Then why do they object to this bill?

They say all they care about is to make sure that Chinese teachers and merchants are not interfered with. Wherein does this bill interfere? But they say it will make China angry and so injure their trade with China. Why should it make China angry? The Chinese Government and the higher classes of the Chinese people can not blame us for not wanting to have millions of coolies dumped into our country to vitiate our civilization and to swamp our labor market. There is no objection on our part to the coming here of Chinese teachers, students, merchants, and travelers on legitimate business and in a legitimate manner, and the only reason why their entrance is hedged about with the formalities and restrictions enumerated in the bill is in order that we may

guard our country against the entrance of laborers under false pretenses in the guise of students, merchants, etc., which has been so great and so frequent an abuse in the past.

Why, then, should the Chinese Government or the Chinese privileged classes complain of the bill? And how can the bill injure our Chinese trade? There is nothing in this objection of the opposition. It is a mere scarecrow.

But I hasten to say that even if the passage of the bill should offend China seriously, and even if it should cost us every dollar of our Chinese trade, that would be infinitely better than for the bill to fail and not to become a law. What is the favor of China and what is the value of our Chinese trade compared with the degradation and ruin of our American labor? At all hazards, Mr. Chairman, and whatever else may or may not happen, Chinese cheap labor must and shall be kept out of this country. It is a terrible misfortune that so much of it has already been admitted. Not another single solitary Chinese laborer should be permitted ever to set foot on American soil. The Chinese may consider it a signal evidence of mercy and forbearance on our part that we have conceded so much to them already.

They come over here as foreigners, to remain foreigners, and living in holes and hovels and swarming like vermin, underbidding and crowding out our laborers, getting all the money they can from us and spending none of it, incurring none of our civic obligations, keeping aloof from our civilization, adopting none of our ways, introducing their own filthy ways, and contaminating the moral and physical atmosphere with their rotten and pestiferous practices. They are unlike all other immigrants. They are not wanted here, and must stay away.

This is a most serious question, Mr. Chairman, from the standpoint of American labor. No more serious question has ever come up for settlement, and none more serious ever could come up. Our American laboring men and women are subjected to a quite severe enough competition among themselves at best. The rewards and returns of labor are scanty enough at best and under natural conditions. But what rewards and returns can Anglo-Saxon labor hope for if subjected to competition with Asiatics who can and do live on 2 cents' worth of rice a day? This is the practical question connected with this bill.

It is a question whether we shall keep up the standards of life in the ranks of American labor, and strive to continue to elevate those standards or deliberately degrade them to the Chinese level. How can any true-hearted American contemplate the latter alternative without horror? But this would infallibly and inevitably be the result, unless the rigid exclusion of Chinese laborers decreed by this bill is maintained.

The injury already done to American labor on the Pacific coast, and to a considerable extent all over the country, by Chinese labor has been very great. There is no telling how many Chinese there are in our far West. The census is entirely unreliable on that point, simply because the Chinese hide and skulk and evade enumeration and identification as much as possible. There are over 50,000 of them in San Francisco alone, and they swarm all over the Pacific and Mountain States. They have practically monopolized the labor field in the Alaska fisheries, and in the Pacific States they have driven to the wall our American working men and women in the lines of household service, cigar making, boot and shoe making, bag making, tailoring, laundering, farming, brick making, mine working, and railroad working, not to speak of many other industries.

But I need not tell over again this old familiar tale of how our honest, brave American working men and women on the frontier have been wounded thus in the house of their friends. The workingmen of the United States—the backbone of this country—stand as a unit, shoulder to shoulder, on this question. They may differ as to other questions, but they are unanimous in their appreciation of this one great overshadowing peril and menace.

At the last convention of the American Federation of Labor, held at Scranton, Pa., in a report of the executive officers, the plea was made for the extension of law for exclusion of Chinese, and they said, in part:

Apart from the fact that we are workingmen, we are also American citizens, fully imbued with the grand principles underlying our form of government and our present system of civilization. The introduction or continuance of an element so entirely at variance with our economic, political, social, and moral conceptions, and so utterly incapable of adaptation to the Caucasian ideas of civilization, is not only dangerous to us as a class but is destructive of the various institutions we are so earnestly striving to uphold, maintain, or attain. Whatever may be the opinion of others, to us this matter does not permit a compromise.

Chinese exclusion is an issue upon which all organized labor is a unit. The hearthstone of the American citizen is in danger. Every incoming coolie means the displacement of an American and the lowering of the American standard of living.

It represents so much money sent out of the country. So much more vice and immorality injected into our social life in its place. We can not afford to trifle with a race of people so utterly unassimilative, so ruinous to our general prosperity, and so blighting to our every prospect. Comparison with immigration of other peoples is only possible by contrast. While we object to an indiscriminate influx of other foreign laborers, we maintain that discrimination in the case of Chinese immigrants is impossible.

We insist upon an exclusion act which will effectively exclude. Provision must be made for proper enforcement of the law when enacted, and the jurisdiction and execution of the law so conferred as to remove it from the legal juggling to which former laws have been subject.

In this plea all organized labor of this country join and urge us to act. You ask that proper provision be made for the enforcement of the law when enacted. I am glad, Mr. Chairman, that I have the honor to serve as a member of the committee that today reports an appropriation of \$200,000 to be used in addition to the amount now on hand for that purpose.

This is not a matter affecting the Pacific States alone. Even if it were, that would be a sufficient reason for enacting this measure. But unless the bars are put up strongly and permanently against this Chinese invasion they will overwhelm not only our West, but also our whole country. There are 400,000,000 of them, one-third of the population of the whole earth. What, with their enormous numbers, their capacity for hard work, and their ability to live on almost nothing, they constitute in sober earnest the most deadly peril of Western and Christian civilization to-day. Our only safety, Mr. Chairman, consists in shutting them out and keeping them out. This is what this bill proposes to do, and that is why I am in favor of it. I trust sincerely that the bill will be passed and become law at the earliest possible date, and before the 1st day of May. [Applause.]

Mr. BENTON. Mr. Chairman, I will not take up much time on this bill. Before I say anything about the provisions of this bill I desire, in answer to some inquiries of my colleague from Missouri, to discuss now for a moment and to make an explanation on District matters. The Subcommittee on Appropriations having in charge the District bill convened ten weeks ago with the intention of having hearings and reporting the bill for the District to Congress; and if the Commissioners of the District of Columbia had asked for the ordinary amount of money the bill perhaps would have been out of the Senate before this time. The Commissioners came in, and their recommendations covered something like ten and a half millions of dollars.

On investigating the amount of revenue which the District could raise by taxation on the subjects of taxation which had heretofore been used, we found that three and a half million dollars was about all they raised in the District by taxation, and under a former statute, the Government appropriating the same amount, that it aggregated about \$7,000,000, and more than that would be outside of our authority to appropriate. The subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations called the Commissioners together and insisted to them that while their recommendations for the interests of the District were probably correct, yet in view of the fact that we were only authorized to appropriate so much as they raised by taxation, that we preferred to defer the taking up and passing the appropriation bill for the District until they had made some efforts through the proper committees of this House and at the other end of the Capitol, to wit, the Committees on the District of Columbia, to raise by taxation a sufficient amount of money that would authorize us to appropriate more money than we had appropriated in bills heretofore.

So that the Committee on Appropriations or its subcommittee on the District of Columbia appropriation bill have waited to see what would be done, because it is our determination—and I believe the full committee will indorse the feeling of the subcommittee—not to appropriate any more money than double the amount the District raises by taxation. The question was raised in the District subcommittee two years ago as to why personal property was not taxed in the District of Columbia. It was intimated to us very broadly that it was the desire of the citizenship of the District to invite gentlemen of wealth to come here and make homes, indicating to them that if they would build a fine home here they would be taxed reasonably on their real property and that their personal property would escape taxation.

In other words, it was an apparent bid to bring wealth here on the suggestion, if not the promise, that it would not be taxed. We know something of the necessities of the District when we know what sort of water we have been drinking, and we know that a filtration plant ought to be made for the District, costing about a million of dollars. We were just as anxious to meet the requirements of the District as the Commissioners were, but we were just as determined, so far as our committee was concerned, that something ought to be done looking toward the taxation of personal and real property in the District in some manner that would be nearer its worth than in the past, and it is because we desire those things done that the District bill has not been reported.

Mr. RUCKER. Can the gentleman inform us when the District appropriation bill will be reported?

Mr. BENTON. We have no information at all to give, because we would rather await the action of Congress as to whether they would authorize taxation of personal property. The Committee on Appropriations, all of them, and I know distinctly that I would not want to agree to issue bonds or a loan. We would rather they would raise the money by taxation.

Mr. RUCKER. You say that you would rather that the District raise the money than issue bonds?

Mr. BENTON. I will not vote for the issuance of bonds at all.

Mr. RUCKER. Has a bill been introduced in the Senate taxing personal property in this District?

Mr. BENTON. I think so.

Mr. RUCKER. As I learn through the papers, everything that relates to District legislation is referred to the Commissioners of the District for their revision and modification.

Mr. BENTON. That is not true so far as the appropriations are concerned. We revise and often modify their estimates.

Mr. RUCKER. I only make that statement based on newspaper reports.

Mr. BENTON. It may be that the District Commissioners are advised with by the Committee on the District of Columbia. They are advised with by us. They make their estimates and we revise them afterwards.

Mr. HEPBURN. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, if he will yield.

Mr. BENTON. Yes.

Mr. HEPBURN. And that is, during the investigation upon this subject that you have referred to, was there any information furnished your committee as to the probable number of millions of property that escaped taxation in the District because of the failure to tax personal property?

Mr. BENTON. Not that I might put in the RECORD as certain, though I have a very fair idea.

Mr. HEPBURN. Would the gentleman object to stating it?

Mr. BENTON. I think from the best estimate I could make it would reach \$250,000,000.

Mr. HEPBURN. That is not now taxed?

Mr. BENTON. That is the best estimate that I can make.

Mr. RUCKER. Is that \$250,000,000 personal or real estate?

Mr. BENTON. Both.

Mr. RUCKER. What part of it is personal?

Mr. BENTON. More than one-half; probably two-thirds.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I would like to make a suggestion to the gentleman. Appropriate to the matter now occupying the gentleman's attention and which he has discussed, I only want to call to his attention one case. This is a matter not only interesting to the people of the District of Columbia, but to the people throughout the whole country. An instance came to my attention within a year and a half or two years prior to this time where a resident of the District had his hundred and some odd thousand dollars loaned out in a single county in the State of Indiana, but he pays no taxes in the District and he pays no taxes in Indiana. I hope if the gentleman has the power he will have the disposition to correct that evil in providing for taxation of personal property in the District.

Mr. KLUTTZ. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I have no time to yield. The gentleman from Missouri yielded to me.

Mr. BENTON. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KLUTTZ. Does not the gentleman know as a matter of common report that a great many millionaires have moved to Washington to dodge taxation of personal property?

Mr. BENTON. I do not know it. It would be a mere matter of opinion if I said yes. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to defer any discussion of this matter until the District bill came before us.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Missouri will allow me, is it not true that the Committee on Appropriations has nothing to do with enacting the law under which taxes are assessed?

Mr. BENTON. Nothing whatever.

Mr. HEMENWAY. That matter belongs to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BENTON. It belongs to the committee that has legislation in charge. We only appropriate what we have got in sight; and I believe the Committee on Appropriations is of one mind on that subject, and that is that the property in the District of Columbia ought to be assessed at a fair valuation, whether it is real or personal, as it is in the States.

Mr. KEHOE. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield to me for a question?

Mr. BENTON. Certainly.

Mr. KEHOE. According to the fair value of property, which is of the greater value, the property of the Government or the property of the individuals in the District?

Mr. BENTON. The property of the individuals, clearly. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say just a word to members on this side of the House about this bill that is before us. The subcommittee of appropriations on the sundry civil bill had the benefit of the long experience of the chairman of the committee in its investigation. We were about this bill three weeks, and I believe we made as good a bill as we could under the circumstances.

I have been asked the question sometimes by members of Congress, privately, why certain appropriations are larger than would

appear to be necessary from the day-to-day expenditures. My answer to that is this: Whenever we appropriate money it is to be in accordance with established law. If we appropriate at any time what seems to be large sums or unnecessary sums, it is not the fault of the Committee on Appropriations. It comes from legislation which Congress has already enacted, which makes continuing appropriations necessary.

Now, this is a very representative and a very fair bill. It appropriates nearly \$13,000,000 less than the last bill. Of course, we do not think for a moment that we are going to get it through Congress in any such condition. This bill as presented here appropriates \$12,500,000 less than the current fiscal year, and is, in the opinion of the Committee on Appropriations, what is necessary, and at least fairly liberal; but when the bill is made up and is settled in conference my opinion is that it will be as large as the current law.

But the bill as presented by the Committee on Appropriations is in their opinion amply sufficient for the purposes for which the appropriations are made. Just one other point. There appears to be a considerable increase in one item to which I called the chairman's attention, and that is for the finishing up of the work in the Yellowstone Park. Your committee were of the opinion that one of two things ought to be done: Either we ought to quit the park entirely, or finish up the public work and make the roads through it, put them in good state of preservation—and we decided to do it. It is not in the opinion of the committee extravagant, but if we are going to hold the park, it is a work of necessity. One word about the proposed building for use of members. I think that it should be the first of the proposed buildings in this city. I stand ready to vote for the appropriation when it is offered in the House. Mr. Chairman, I now yield an hour to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BELL].

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. GROSVENOR having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On March 31, 1902:

- H. R. 2123. An act granting a pension to Elizabeth M. Folds;
- H. R. 2669. An act granting a pension to Isabella Compton;
- H. R. 3769. An act granting a pension to Susan Terry;
- H. R. 3873. An act granting an increase of pension to William C. Flowers;
- H. R. 5073. An act granting a pension to Christina Daniels;
- H. R. 6487. An act granting a pension to Kazier Washburn;
- H. R. 7846. An act granting a pension to Michael Tynan;
- H. R. 7968. An act granting a pension to Norris L. Lungren;
- H. R. 8292. An act granting a pension to Hester Thomas;
- H. R. 9296. An act granting a pension to Mary E. Chapman;
- H. R. 4456. An act granting a pension to Ruth B. Osborne;
- H. R. 5289. An act granting a pension to Malvina C. Stith;
- H. R. 6018. An act granting a pension to Lue Emma McJunkin;
- H. R. 7074. An act granting a pension to Benjamin F. Draper;
- H. R. 8293. An act granting a pension to Amanda Jacko;
- H. R. 9397. An act granting a pension to John S. Lewis;
- H. R. 1325. An act granting an increase of pension to William J. Wallace;
- H. R. 2547. An act granting an increase of pension to William M. Guy;
- H. R. 2786. An act granting an increase of pension to William K. Koffman;
- H. R. 4468. An act granting an increase of pension to John B. Kurth;
- H. R. 5109. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick M. Hahn;
- H. R. 6864. An act granting an increase of pension to Milton A. Embick;
- H. R. 7320. An act granting an increase of pension to James Mantach;
- H. R. 7424. An act granting an increase of pension to John Craig;
- H. R. 7771. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank Seaman;
- H. R. 10132. An act granting an increase of pension to John Garner;
- H. R. 10956. An act granting an increase of pension to Frances K. Morrison;
- H. R. 1529. An act granting an increase of pension to John G. Brower;
- H. R. 2673. An act granting an increase of pension to John Vale;
- H. R. 3272. An act granting an increase of pension to Israel P. Covey;
- H. R. 4488. An act granting an increase of pension to Selden E. Whitcher;

H. R. 5543. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Skinner;

H. R. 7823. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob D. Caldwell;

H. R. 9227. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick Shafer;

H. R. 11145. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Key; and

H. R. 3278. An act to correct the military record of C. R. Dickson. On March 29, 1902:

S. 4260. An act to correct the military record of James A. Somerville; and

H. J. Res. 171. Joint resolution for appointment of members of board of managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

On March 31, 1902:

H. R. 3136. An act for a public building for a marine-hospital at Pittsburgh, Pa.

#### SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I am in the unfortunate condition of being compelled to talk about measures that are not before this House. I have rarely, if ever, done such a thing before, and I very much regret it now; but, from the condition of the House itself and its peculiar workings, if any member of this House desires to discuss any great question that comes before it he must do it either prior to the hearing or after the bill has actually passed this body.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment one of the most, if not the most, important questions that is before the American people to-day, or should be before the American people, is to recover the House of Representatives from the low condition in which it has fallen.

Sir, we may shut our eyes as much as we will, but it is in everybody's mouth to-day, whether Democrat, Republican, Prohibitionist, or whoever he may be, that the House of Representatives signifies nothing in the American régime of government. A few days ago I was very much impressed by finding a Republican newspaper from the great State of Pennsylvania, one from the great State of California, and one from the District of Columbia sounding this warning at one and the same time. I want to read a little of these opinions, and I will begin with the Washington Post of this city:

One reason, doubtless, why Representatives are so anxious to be Senators is that the House has ceased to be a deliberative body, but is controlled by a junta that dictates what shall and what shall not be done, while the Senate is preeminently a deliberative body of 90 ambassadors from half as many sovereign Commonwealths. As far as deliberation is concerned, the House that was presided over by GALUSHA A. GROW was as different from the House that is presided over by DAVID B. HENDERSON as the Roman senate that offered for public sale the ground on which was encamped Hannibal's victorious army differed from the Roman senate that confirmed the purchase of the imperial purple. It will not always be so. The mutterings and murmurings presage the coming of a storm that none can resist.

That is from a paper published in our midst, that watches you and watches me and watches these proceedings every day. About the same day from San Francisco comes this editorial:

The leaders of the House of Representatives appear in the curious attitude of persons bent upon the destruction of their own importance. Absolute power over the presentation, discussion, and amendment of measures has been given to the Speaker and the Committee on Rules; and this coterie of less than half a dozen men entirely dominates all proceedings in the House of Representatives. It decides what shall be considered, for how long, and by whom; and the precise force of any measure is determined in advance.

Deliberation under this method of procedure comes out of the question, and discussion sinks to the level of mere mechanical utterance, so far as it affects the House of Representatives. Such a deliberate self-abasement of a great legislative body is without a parallel in the history of the world. It is the Senate—sometimes called "the Millionaires' Club"—which now deliberates and legislates, and the country recognizes the fact, whilst the House itself concedes it. It has become the one branch of Congress which now regularly determines the course and character of deliberation. No issue is now ever joined with it and no fight ever made against it. The fate that has now well-nigh overtaken the House is a singular one in so great a Republic and well worthy of the study of the political philosopher.

A few days ago in a bunch of the bright newspaper men gathered at this capital, one who had been here over twenty years advocating Republicanism stood in his place and said: "A few years ago every principal newspaper man in Washington crowded into the House of Representatives; the inferior ones stayed in the Senate. But," said he, "to-day no experienced newspaper man ever cares anything about the House of Representatives. It is no longer considered a deliberative body." And a Republican of national reputation, whose position is in the other Chamber, said: "Yes; you may talk about the deleterious effects of the steel trust; you may talk about the injuries of the railroad trusts; you may talk about the injuries of the sugar trust; but I will tell you the most dangerous trust in America to-day is the legislative trust that is placed in a few hands in the House of Representatives and is breaking down all of the powers and the principles upon which it was built."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want this morning to talk about the three financial bills that have been reported to this House or ap-

proved by the Republican members. And why do I bring this question before the House at this hour? It is because you know and because I know that there has not been a question upon which parties differed in principle for years that has been debated or that has been permitted to be debated on this floor. We are begged to debate when some matter of no importance is up. We are deprived of debate, we are deprived of the opportunity of amendment, we are deprived of discussion when a great question comes up in this forum for final consideration.

When the bill to strike down the sugar industry of this country, which will come before us in a few days, you will see it put through with whip and spur; and no man who is interested in that great question will be permitted to amend that bill or discuss it. Therefore we are forced prematurely to come here and say what we wish to say about these questions before the proper time, or after it, or not at all. But, thank God, we can ask the sugar growers of twenty States what they think of a party that takes the tariff off the things they produce at the dictation of a gigantic sugar trust and leaves it on everything they buy. We can hang out the insignia of the astute General Dick: "Here is our free trade for the farmer and here is the protection for the sugar trust." We shall also try to find some way to inform them that we were gagged and could not debate or offer an amendment. In my judgment we have now pending before this body three of the most dangerous bills, taking them together, that ever were presented before this body in the history of this Government.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. May I remind the gentleman that he has failed to call the attention of the House and the country to the responsibility of the Republican party for the condition that prevails here with reference to the rules and the Committee on Rules?

Mr. BELL. The country knows who is responsible for that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Democratic party for a number of years past has been charged as being currency "tinkerers." We had a great campaign on what the politicians on the stump called the silver question. I never discussed it from that standpoint in this body or upon the stump. Nobody that ever understood our side of the question ever discussed it in this body or on the stump as the silver question. We all realized that the point at issue was not whether you should have silver, or gold, or paper. The issue was shall we have an abundance of Government money issued and controlled by the Government for all the people or bank paper controlled by the banks for the banks.

The historian Hume says:

In every kingdom into which money begins to flow in greater abundance than formerly everything takes on a new face for greater prosperity.

Henri Cernuschi, the eminent French financier, says:

The value of money depends upon its quantity. The purchasing power is always in relation to its quantity.

The political economist Ricardo says:

That commodities would rise and fall in price in proportion to the increase or diminution of money, I assume as a fact that is incontrovertible.

The whole philosophy of the silver question is that gold, silver, and paper issued by the Government is safer than mere bank promises to pay, of which we now have \$300,000,000 in our circulation, and an effort is now being made to double it.

The following bill is put forth as the Republican idea of a financial panacea, with a unanimous report of Republican members, viz:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to coin the silver bullion in the Treasury purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, into such denominations of subsidiary silver coin as he may deem necessary to meet public requirements, and thereafter, as public necessities may demand, to recoin silver dollars into subsidiary coin; and so much of any act as fixes a limit to the aggregate of subsidiary silver coin outstanding, and so much of any act as directs the coinage of any portion of the bullion purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, into standard silver dollars, is hereby repealed.

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to maintain at all times at parity with gold the legal-tender silver dollars remaining outstanding; and to that end he is hereby directed to exchange gold for legal-tender silver dollars when presented to the Treasury in the sum of \$5 or any multiple thereof; and all provisions of law for the use or maintenance of the reserve fund in the Treasury relating to United States notes are, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, hereby made applicable to the exchange of legal-tender silver dollars.

The question at issue still is whether you should have money issued by the Government in full and necessary quantity or whether you should leave it to the banks of the country to issue the money and contract or expand it at will. Now, our contention and the pith of the contention of all of the so-called silver men has ever been based upon the quantitative theory of money. We have always contended and now contend, and the Republican party now agrees with us, that we must keep up an equilibrium between the amount of property to be exchanged and the amount of money with which to make those exchanges, and therefore we, in common with all the economists who have gone before us, including our Secretaries of the Treasury from time to time, have said that all these panics have been occasioned by the scarcity and not by the abundance of money; and I lay down another proposition, that in no case has there been a question raised as to the form of the money in times of panic, but in every case the clamor has been for money of any kind or any quality whatever.

You will generally find in one of these measures a small amount of good, a mere crumb for the people, and it climaxes with the colossal lion's share shuffled into the already bursting coffers of the money changers.

This bill provides for the very proper raise of the limit of subsidiary coin from \$100,000,000 to \$120,000,000. This subsidiary coin does not invade the domain of the national-bank notes or bonds, hence this comforting crumb is cheerfully extended to the masses of the people.

In 1900 the limit of subsidiary coin in the United States was \$80,000,000. Owing to the great increase of our bank currency and gold coinage, together with the new trade coming from our own consumption and also the new trade from England for her Boer war, we were required to raise the limit on our divisional or minor coins from \$80,000,000 to \$100,000,000 to accommodate our greatly increased domestic trade. Our great and increasing coining of gold and our increased trade continues, and the Director of the Mint has requested an additional raise of the limit of our subsidiary coins of \$20,000,000 more, to \$120,000,000—equaling the astonishing increase of 50 per cent in our necessity for small change in the space of two years.

It is commendable that this requirement is supplied in the bill. The very fact that we now require 50 per cent more small change than we did before these wars, before our marvelous crops at home and the great droughts abroad, and before the mighty stimulus given to trade by the enormous increase in our gold coinage and the great increase in our per capita circulation, establishes the pressing necessity for a like increase in our general currency. Does this bill provide for such an increase or permit the natural increase now going on? Nay, verily; but, on the contrary, it seeks to shrink the volume of real money in the enormous sum of over \$500,000,000, or to the extent of our present amount of coined silver dollars. But, say the authors of this ungenerous shuffle of the wealth of the people into the pockets of the bankers and bondholders, "We do not destroy the silver dollar; we simply enable the people to take it to the Treasury and convert it into gold." My dear sirs, the people do not want to convert it into gold, and you know it. That means that you purpose to convert a silver dollar into a mere order to pay it in gold, or reduce our real money to the amount of your gold stock. Under the law a holder may now take gold to the Treasury, deposit it, and receive gold certificates for it. At any future time he can return the gold certificates and get back the gold coin. All of this time, however, the Treasury must keep the gold in the vaults for the payment of the certificate.

This act, if passed, would not only leave the outstanding certificate above described against the gold dollar, but every one of the 500,000,000 and odd silver dollars would be converted into gold certificates, redeemable in the exact manner as gold certificates are redeemable, and would put \$3 in certificates for each gold dollar for its redemption.

We now hold in the Treasury continually \$150,000,000 in gold to secure the redemption of probably \$335,000,000 greenbacks (nominally \$346,000,000, but with destruction and loss there is nothing approaching \$346,000,000) and Treasury notes. This great sum of unused money in the hands of the people at the low rate of 3 per cent would be worth \$9,000,000 per annum.

If this bill should pass what would be the result? At the very next session of Congress the "currency tinkers" would be backed by the great banking interests of the world and a subservient press demanding that the gold reserve be raised to \$300,000,000 to secure the payment of the silver dollars in gold. They will get it, as they have everything else they have demanded in modern times, and there will be piled up in the Treasury, or more probably in the national banks, idle money to the amount of \$300,000,000, worth, at 3 per cent, \$9,000,000.

The "currency tinkers" for the past forty years have worked in and out of season for the banking and bondholding interests alone, and these especially favored ones have made untold millions out of these machinations, and in every instance in the inverse ratio the laborers and general producers have been plundered.

Many times during the existence of this Government we have had financial panics, every one of which is attributable to the shrinkage or limitation of the power of the currency, or to the "tinkers" with the currency. No panic has ever passed away without a pathetic trail of devastation among debtors, ordinary producers, and laborers which was heartrending. But few panics, if any, have ever visited any country that the great bond and mortgage holding and the great banking portion of the people were not financially benefited. The small banks and the small financial institutions have always been caught in the wreckage. The great panic of 1837 occurred during Van Buren's Administration, and is rightly attributed to a tinkering with the currency. Daniel Webster ascribed the panic to the interference of the Government with the currency, and to what was known as the "specie circular," requiring all public lands to be paid for in specie.

On May 10, 1837, all of the banks of New York suspended payment, and devastation and wreckage of values were rife everywhere except among the powerful money-owning and money-lending institutions of the country that defied the public and the people by suspending payment.

Prof. W. G. Sumner, of Yale, in his History of American Currency, states that nearly all of the banks made money out of the suspension and paid big dividends during the year.

The panic of 1857 was brought on largely by the "tinkers" with currency in Congress. Prior to 1857 all of the gold coins and most of the silver coins of foreign nations were full legal tender in the United States. Gold had been overvalued by an act of Congress, and in consequence great quantities of foreign gold accumulated in the United States, and much of it was held as bank reserves, was of light weight, and was depreciated in bullion value. In February, 1857, Congress demonetized all foreign coins without supplying anything to fill the vacuum. The coins were usually of such light weight that they could not be profitably converted into American coins, were exported never to return, which brought on the panic and spread ruin again to all classes except the owners of bonds, mortgages, and ready money. The shrinkage in the volume of the currency greatly enhanced the value of ready money and gilt-edged bonds and securities, and in an inverse ratio depreciated the value of labor and of all other property, to the ruin of producers and laborers.

The awful panic of 1873 was brought on by the currency "tinkers," who persistently demanded the unnecessary retirement of the great volume of greenbacks without providing anything to fill their places. In a speech in the Senate, January 27, 1869, when the currency "tinkers" were strenuously demanding a more rapid retirement of the greenback, Hon. John Sherman, before he became a great bank-stock investor and when he was known throughout the country as plain, honest John Sherman, said:

It is not possible to take this voyage without the sorest distress. To every person except a capitalist out of debt or a salaried officer or annuitant it is a period of loss, danger, lassitude of trade, fall of wages, suspension of enterprise, bankruptcy, and disaster, and it means the ruin of dealers whose debts are twice their business capital, though one-third less than their actual property. It means the fall of all agricultural productions without any great reduction of taxes. When that day comes all enterprise will be suspended, every bank will have contracted its currency to the lowest limit, and the debtor, compelled to meet in coin a debt contracted in currency, will find the coin hoarded in the Treasury, no representative of coin in circulation, his property shrunk, not only to the extent of the depreciation of the currency, but still more by the artificial scarcity made by the holders of gold.

He declared that the proposed retirement of the greenback to the extent proposed "would be an act of folly without an example in evil in modern times." (Cong. Globe, 1869, p. 629.)

Notwithstanding all of the timely warning, the currency "tinkers" never ceased until they brought on that awful panic of 1873, that reduced labor to idleness and want and pauperized the debtors all over this land, and enriched those solvent money, bond, and mortgage holders by a forced conveyance of the property of the debtors into the hands of the capitalistic classes at from 25 per cent to 50 per cent of its true value.

When the financial skies began to clear in 1874 and honest men with sad hearts began to view the spectacle and to right the true causes of the lamentable disaster, ruin, and misery which it had left in its trail, Hon. John A. Logan, March 17, 1874, graphically, and with a sad heart, said upon the floor of the United States Senate:

But, sir, that the panic (1873) was not due to the character of the currency is proved by the history of the panic itself. \* \* \* No, sir, the panic was not attributable to the character of the currency, but to a money famine, and to nothing else. In the very midst of the panic we saw the leading bankers and business men of New York pressing and urging the President and the Secretary of the Treasury to let loose twenty or twenty-five millions more of the same paper for their relief. \* \* \* Why is it that Representatives forget the interests of their own section and stand up here as the advocates of the gold brokers and money lenders and sharks, the same class of men whose tables Christ turned over and whom He lashed out of the temple at Jerusalem. Sir, turn this matter as we will and look at it from any side whatever, and it does present the appearance of being a stupendous scheme of the money holders to seize the opportunity of placing under their control the vast industries of the nation. Therefore, I warn Senators against pushing too far the great conflict now going on between capital and labor.

The diabolical panic of 1893, properly designated as the "bankers' panic," was the most unnecessary and cruel thing that was ever precipitated upon an innocent and confiding people. This, too, was brought on by the pestiferous currency "tinkers." Senator Sherman and others had sounded the alarm by stating in the Senate that the present national banking system would soon go out of existence, because the Government bonds would be paid off, leaving no basis for a national-bank circulation. The national bankers got together, concluded to have the purchasing clause of the Sherman act repealed and thereby stop the issue of Treasury notes monthly for silver purchasers; stop the coinage of silver and force a bank-note currency and an issue of long-time interest-bearing bonds upon the people, for banking purposes.

The National Bankers' Association issued a confidential circular letter to the bankers throughout the United States, telling them that Senator Sherman would introduce a bill to repeal the

purchasing clause of the Sherman act, for them to see their member of Congress immediately curtail loans and circulation of bank notes for a time, and they could secure the passage of the bill. A crusade of intimidation and currency squeeze was begun that drove the people to hoarding, the banks and business men to withdrawing credits, culminating in the most disastrous panic that ever cursed this nation.

Robert Ingersoll, the great campaigner of the Republican party, immediately christened it the "bankers' panic." He said:

This is a bankers' panic. They have been predicting a panic for years, and have done all they could to fulfill the prediction.

Senator David B. Hill, of New York, from their very midst, and contemporaneous with the panic, declared it the bankers' legitimate offspring. From the floor of the United States Senate he said:

With ghoulish glee they welcomed every bank failure, especially in the silver States, little dreaming that such failures would soon occur at their own doors. They encouraged the hoarding of money; they inaugurated the policy of refusing loans to the people, even upon the best security; they circulated false propositions; passed absurd and alarming resolutions; predicted the direst disaster; attacked the credit of the Government; sought to exact a premium on currency, and attempted in every way to spread distrust broadcast throughout the land. The best organized financial system in the world could not stand such an organized and vicious attack upon it. These disturbers, these promoters of the public peril, represent largely the creditor class.

This panic was not caused by any objection among the people to any form of money. The Secretary of the Treasury showed at the time that the people generally had lost confidence in the banks and were drawing out and hoarding their money, but without complaint accepted silver, silver certificates, Treasury notes, greenbacks, or bank notes. The very silver dollars that the bankers feigned to fear went to a premium in New York of \$2.50 per thousand during the panic.

If the customs of some members of this House do not cease, in the early morning of this bright, new century the deadly upas of another blighting panic will lie at the doors of the pestiferous "currency tinkers," done in the interests of the cormorants that have already confiscated the wealth of the nation through cunningly throwing the people into inextricable complications. Whether these alert gentlemen bring this about unwittingly or premeditatedly, the direful effects will be equally excruciating.

Mr. SIBLEY. What was the date of that circular?

Mr. BELL. It was in August, 1893.

Now, sir, the Secretary of the Treasury in his last report speaks of this awful panic. He says practically the same thing about the instability of banks in panicky times. Secretary Gage, on page 76, in speaking of the panic of 1893, says:

We have not far to look to see this well illustrated. The panic of 1893 is a marked example. Within a period of less than twelve months bank credits (deposits) were contracted to a total of more than \$400,000,000—

Think of it—

while the actual cash holdings of the banks were increased by nearly \$50,000,000.

Think of it. The banks increased their own money in their vaults \$50,000,000 within twelve months and withdrew \$400,000,000 in credits during the panic of 1893.

That is to say a volume of bank credits before available for transfer in the ordinary channels of trade was suddenly diverted to the payment of pre-existing indebtedness from the public to the banks. This is shown by the fact that "loans and discounts" were reduced during the period to an amount substantially corresponding to the fall in deposits.

These bills, if passed, mean the destruction of over \$500,000,000 of silver in the United States. It not only means that, but it means the contraction of the currency when the population of this country is growing more rapidly than ever before during its history, increasing the population, doubling the wealth, and cutting down the money supply. The Secretary of the Treasury calls attention to the fact that there must be an increase in the currency, for the purpose of expanding, for the benefit of this new population, and he suggests that there should be at least an expansion of \$300,000,000, but he suggests bank paper.

Now they have introduced and reported a second bill as bad as the first. It takes in all the propositions of the first except the exchange of gold for silver. Now, then, I come to the third bill, known as the banking bill, the most infamous and dangerous bill ever introduced in this House or in the other Chamber, and I will not forego or except any other bills in their radical tendency that were ever introduced anywhere. This so-called banking bill means the absolute slavery of every industry in this country. Have you thought of it; have you looked at it? But let us see what this bill is and what it proposes to do. The first object is to create a division of banking and currency—three good, fat offices with salaries of \$7,500 per annum. Very good so far as it goes. They are to hold office for twelve years. A nice berth!

What else does it provide? It provides that these men will assume the redemption of one hundred and thirty million of these outstanding notes, although so much deprecated; that they shall issue banking currency on their capital stock to their full value finally. They start in by gradations of 10 per cent one year, 10

per cent another year, and 10 per cent another year, and they finally get up to the point where they set aside all the paper currency issued by the Government, as good as the Government that issues it, and then it must be followed with banking paper issued by these gentlemen, not on United States bonds, but it must be issued on the capital stock, and not only be issued on the capital stock, but the Secretary of the Treasury asks the Government to refuse further to guarantee these notes. Let the people go.

Now, my friends, we are going very rapidly. Since this banking system was organized, in 1863, there has been 404 failures of national banks. But these national banks could not issue circulation except up to 90 per cent of the bonds underlying them, and yet the people of the United States have had 404 of these banks fail, and up to the end of last year people have been deprived of over \$40,000,000 of their hard-earned money by the failure of these banks, when they had only the right of issuing circulation up to 90 per cent of their United States bonds.

In 1900, according to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, there were over 100 national banks in the hands of receivers, and yet in March, 1900, we gave them the right to issue circulation up to the full par value of their bonds. We allowed them to issue 10 per cent more currency than before, notwithstanding 404 of these institutions had gone under since 1863.

They cleaned up last year and put, I think it was, 26 out of business, with a loss to the people of over \$1,000,000. I want to show you the danger. As I have contended often before, this Government never intended that a professional banker should be at the head of the Treasury Department. The national-bank law requires now that certain officers of the Government who deal with imports and exports shall not be an importer or exporter, and neither shall they have stock in any concern while holding one of the lower positions—I believe it is one of the officers represented under and appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury—and it created great comment when Secretary McCulloch was put in at the head of the Treasury in war times.

Bankers are as good as other men. The banker looks at finance from one standpoint, he studies it from one standpoint, and the political economist studies it from another. What do we have? Prior to the present Secretary of the Treasury, we had a man who was at the time of his appointment, as I remember, the president of the National Bankers' Association of the United States, and he asks in his report that we turn this Government soul and body over to the bankers of the United States.

Now, there is no guessing about that, and yet he shows the utter inefficiency of the banks. At page 74 of his recent report he says:

The function and office of a bank is to give its money obligations in exchange for the money obligations of its customers and dealers. This is the business the bank chiefly prosecutes.

He shows that there is but little money handled by banks; that they sell their credit and they lend their credit, and he demonstrates it here, and he goes on to say:

This is made plain by a glance at the reports furnished by the banks to the office of the Comptroller of the Currency. At the period of their last report the national banks, as a whole, held obligations against the public to an amount in excess of \$3,018,000,000.

Think of it! now, \$3,018,000,000, while the public enjoyed a total of credits upon the books of the banks to an amount in excess of \$3,044,000,000.

That was \$800,000,000 more than all the money there is in the United States. They had credits on their books, supposed to be on deposit, of \$3,018,000,000, or \$800,000,000 more than all the money in the United States. The Secretary logically says that they do not deal in money, but they simply lend their credit to the individual. Now, what does he want us to do? He says the banking laws are not made for storm; they are made only for fair weather, and he tells us that the banking facilities will not take care of the public in a storm, but it will in fair weather.

Now, what does he want done? He wants you to give over to the banks full power to issue and control all paper money.

I want to show you where the Secretary of the Treasury himself admits and warns us that the banks will not take care of us whenever we have trouble. It is all right in clear weather. Says the Secretary of the Treasury:

No sooner do the symptoms of financial and business trouble appear than the banks, under the rule of self-preservation, suspend to the farthest limit possible their operations of loaning and discounting. They cease to give credit on their books in exchange for debt obligations from their dealers. The daily creation of the necessary medium of exchange—banking credits—ceases or becomes entirely inadequate to the commercial requirements.

The daily natural liquidation of credits continues, resulting in contraction. Business men carrying goods and securities, by aid of the bank credit, are obliged to sell with little regard to cost. Contemplated enterprises are abandoned; orders for future delivery of goods are rescinded. And as these successive steps mark the downward movement, the banker becomes the more reluctant to perform his important function of loaning his credits for commercial and industrial uses.

We thus perceive that the bracing support which had prompted and sustained business progress, without which indeed such progress would have been impossible, is withdrawn at the very moment when the supply is the most needed.

That is the position we take. Your banks are all right in fair weather; in storm they help the crisis.

Mr. MADDUX. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BELL. Certainly.

Mr. MADDUX. I do not want to interrupt the line of the gentleman's argument, but I do want to ask some questions in regard to one matter which I find in this bill.

Mr. BELL. I do not want to discuss the bill now. For the present I want to consume my time on other questions. I hope the gentleman will excuse me.

Now, the Secretary of the Treasury contends that we have not money enough, notwithstanding that the bank bill that I have been reading provides that the silver coinage shall be stopped. It provides that all the paper money of the Government shall be canceled. It provides that the bullion in the Treasury shall be held only for subsidiary coin. Yet the Secretary of the Treasury says that we have not the necessary currency; and he suggests the way in which we shall get it; that is, through the banks.

I read further from the language of the Secretary:

It is safe, I think, to estimate that in three years the total capital of national banks, if allowed to issue currency on their capital stock, would increase from the present amount of \$663,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000. With the right to issue circulating notes to par of their capital there would be the possibility of increasing the paper-money supply as population increased by the difference in amount between the present supply (greenbacks and bank notes both included) of, say, \$706,000,000 and \$1,000,000,000, or, in round numbers, \$300,000,000.

The Secretary says that our increased population requires this increase of the circulation, and he suggests an increase of \$300,000,000 in bank paper, and at the same time these banks are trying to contract the currency quite as much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BELL. I ask that I may be permitted to conclude my remarks. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENTON] suggested that I should have all the time that I wanted.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to finish his remarks.

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Now, Mr. Chairman, this banking bill which I propose to put into the RECORD provides for destroying the greenbacks issued by the Government and issuing a greenback by the banks themselves. In fact, they offer a piece of paper that is a copy of the old greenback itself. Again, they propose to pay interest at 1 per cent on the deposits of this Government in the banks and to force the money of the Government into their vaults. But they very adroitly provide that the interest on this currency shall be for the benefit of the banks themselves—shall be used to relieve them from the redemption of their currency and other matters of like importance.

I want to say just a word about the condition that is now going on and is proposed to be intensified by this bill. The proposition is to turn the industries of this Government, soul and body, over to the banks, they controlling the entire currency, and they are to do it simply on the capital stock of the banks themselves.

This being Monday, we have this morning, I believe, no Treasury report, but I believe I have the figures as given a day or so ago, and they show in the banks of the United States \$118,688,003.32.

What is that money worth on the market as shown by the rates that the States get for their money on deposit? Take, for instance, the State of Massachusetts as exhibiting about a fair average. According to the amount paid for the use of that money, the money the Government has now in the banks drawing no interest is worth over \$8,000 a day. That money on deposit has a market value as well established as the market value of corn or cotton or wheat.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] and I a couple of years ago got into a dispute. I said this money had as well established a value as any other commodity. He denied it. He said that the banks did not want it; that it was not profitable to them. I sat down that night and wrote to every State treasurer of the United States to ascertain what the funds of the various States were worth as a deposit, and I found by a return from the gentleman's own State of Connecticut that it had just drawn \$32,000 from the banks of Connecticut as 2 per cent interest on money upon deposit. I found that my friends from the State of Kansas, received from New York, are paying them 2 per cent on their deposits; found the great State of Massachusetts, the great State of New York, and everywhere else, drawing from 2 to 3½ per cent, and some States were paying as high as 4.

Mr. MANN. What do you mean by States paying?

Mr. BELL. I mean that the States let out their money to the banks just the same as they sell any other commodity.

Mr. MANN. Well, the banks were paying.

Mr. BELL. The banks were paying for the deposits. It generally run from 2 to 3½ per cent if it remained any length of time, and from 1½ to 2½ per cent on money subject to daily checks.

Mr. MANN. Has the gentleman made investigation as to how far the payment of interest on deposits of public moneys goes to the public owning the funds?

Mr. BELL. All except in a few States. There were a few States that did not pay their State treasurers anything of consequence, and the treasurers were supposed to get their salaries out of it. Some of the Southern States, I think, did not pay over \$800 or \$900.

Mr. MANN. It is an interesting question. In my own State we pay pretty good salaries to treasurers, and they keep the 2 per cent on bank deposits in addition.

Mr. BELL. The treasurers do?

Mr. MANN. I regret to say that the treasurers do. I understand the gentleman to say that generally the municipality or State owning the fund collects the interest.

Mr. BELL. The majority of the States draw the interest, and it runs from 4 per cent down.

Mr. MANN. Has the gentleman found whether there is any place where money of the National Government is deposited and where the banks receiving public funds do so without the payment of interest to somebody?

Mr. BELL. Nowhere; and that is where I say we are menial to the banks themselves.

Mr. MANN. I suppose the gentleman has no information that is definite as to whether anybody receives any interest on account of the deposit of national funds?

Mr. BELL. Oh, I do not know about that. During the great cry, when there were some \$20,000,000 in this bank over in New York and the bankers were making a row over it, they insisted, and the president of one of the great banking associations said, that money was worth 4 per cent to the banks; it was actually worth 4 per cent to the banks because it was permanent, and at that very minute New York on its canal funds, because they were somewhat permanent, received 3 per cent. I have all of the original letters yet. Pennsylvania draws interest, New York draws interest, Massachusetts draws interest, and every State, with a few rare exceptions, draws interest from deposits.

Mr. MANN. You mean the banks in those States—

Mr. BELL. I mean they make this money earn something.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman state what security these banks give before receiving the national deposit?

Mr. BELL. Just whatever they and the State powers agree upon.

Mr. SCOTT. I did not refer to the State deposits. I referred to the deposits of the National Government.

Mr. BELL. The National Treasury requires United States bonds, but there is no reason why they should not take any good security, as the States do. In this very bill that now has the approval of the banking association they are insisting on doing away with the bonds and issuing the money for this Government on their capital stock alone.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Is there not this difference between State deposits and national deposits? It is true, I think, that most of the States receive interest on deposits. I know in my State the State treasurer receives at the present time 2½ per cent on all deposits that he makes in national banks scattered over the State. The deposits are more or less permanent, so regarded; but with the United States deposits the United States Government requires the equivalent of United States bonds as additional security.

Mr. BELL. That simply means that a few shall have all the money.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. And the State has no security but the credit of the bank. The United States are secured by their own bonds.

Mr. COCHRAN. I think it is absolutely true that the States require security the same as the National Government does. I know mine does.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. I do not know how it is with your State.

Mr. COCHRAN. They require security.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Not usually. In New England the State treasurers have a right to deposit in any State or national institution.

Mr. BELL. During President Cleveland's Administration, President McKinley from this floor severely criticised President Cleveland's Administration, because he said at that minute there were lying in the banks of the country \$69,000,000 of the people's money, and that the people had a right to interest upon that money, and that President Cleveland's Administration allowed the banks to have it for nothing and to toll it back to the people at a high price. That was his view of it. But instead of there now being \$69,000,000 there are \$118,000,000 of this money in these banks that have the Government bonds. They get it for nothing and they lease it out to the people. In this banking bill they propose to let this money go into the banks, but it is only on bond securities, and therefore these big banks would get it.

Now, there is another thing about this banking bill that I want to speak of, and that is this: An effort has been made for many

years to get two provisions in the banking laws. One is to have a foreign provision, a provision for foreign banking, so that a combination may take a charter from this Government to go abroad with, an official prestige as it were, and exploit those countries, and probably have a war ship hanging around now and then at your expense and mine to protect their capital and their investments there. That is in this bill. It has been defeated by this House I do not know how many times. Since I have been here I know of one time. That is one provision.

Another provision for which they have been yearning for years has been the branch-bank system. The great central banks in New York and elsewhere have been clamoring for years that they may be allowed to have a great central bank in New York with branches all over the United States. When that system is established, then good-bye to the small banks everywhere. They become mere agents of these big banks, handling their money, hiring their currency from them, or go out of existence. It means death to the little banks. That is the object.

The little bank has got to serve the big one or go out of existence, and the fact is, it will go out of existence. That is provided for in this bill. They are to have the right both to take the prestige of this Government and go to Germany or England or anywhere

in foreign countries, with a quasi official title, to do banking, and I suppose our warships will hover around every time they get into a little trouble to protect United States investments. We are getting now too many men who are trying to go abroad. The idea now is entertained that this country is not good enough to live in, and day after day you find men are moving their families abroad, buying houses there, while ostensibly living here, or they themselves are going abroad.

It is pretty hard now to pass many days without seeing somebody who is just going abroad to remain. I notice this morning a very important gentleman has just sold out to go to the mother country—going to become a British citizen and live there because he likes it better than this country. Many are going, and when they do not become citizens of a foreign country, they will in fact move abroad and be only nominal American citizens. I think we should not encourage that in any particular. I here exhibit the increased circulation of gold and silver which accounts in a large measure for our phenomenal prosperity.

## DEPOSITS OF GOLD SINCE 1873.

The value of the deposits of gold bullion, coin, and jewelers' bars at the mints and assay offices of the United States, by fiscal years, since 1873 is exhibited in the following table:

Deposits of gold at United States mints and assay offices since 1873.

Fiscal year ended June 30—	Character of gold deposited.					Total.
	Domestic bullion.	Domestic coin (coining value).	Foreign bullion.	Foreign coin (United States coining value).	Jewelers' bars, old plate, etc.	
1873	\$28,868,569.78	\$27,116,948.27	\$426,107.44	\$518,542.14	\$774,218.25	\$57,704,385.88
1874	29,736,387.82	6,275,367.29	3,162,519.92	9,313,882.47	654,353.56	49,142,511.06
1875	34,266,124.52	1,714,311.50	739,439.66	1,111,792.26	724,625.96	38,556,293.90
1876	37,590,529.39	417,947.15	1,141,905.76	2,111,083.80	681,819.32	41,943,285.42
1877	43,478,103.93	447,339.68	1,931,163.12	2,068,260.73	837,911.25	48,787,778.71
1878	48,075,123.76	301,021.79	2,068,679.05	1,316,461.09	907,932.20	52,609,217.89
1879	38,549,705.89	198,063.17	1,069,796.89	1,498,819.71	937,751.14	42,254,156.80
1880	35,821,705.40	206,328.82	21,200,997.23	40,426,559.63	1,176,505.77	98,835,096.85
1881	35,815,036.55	440,776.97	37,771,472.26	55,462,885.74	1,943,430.93	130,833,102.45
1882	31,288,511.97	569,356.80	12,783,807.04	20,304,810.78	1,770,166.36	66,756,652.95
1883	32,481,642.38	374,129.23	4,727,143.22	6,906,083.80	1,858,107.42	46,347,106.05
1884	29,079,596.33	263,117.17	6,023,734.45	9,095,461.45	1,864,769.26	46,326,678.66
1885	31,584,436.64	325,210.97	11,221,846.45	7,893,217.77	1,869,363.26	52,894,075.09
1886	32,456,493.64	393,545.28	4,317,068.27	5,673,565.04	2,069,077.00	44,900,749.23
1887	32,973,027.41	516,984.63	22,571,328.70	9,896,512.28	2,265,219.85	68,223,072.87
1888	32,406,306.59	492,512.60	21,741,042.44	14,596,885.03	2,988,750.90	72,225,497.56
1889	31,440,778.93	585,066.87	2,136,516.66	4,447,475.99	3,526,597.31	42,136,435.76
1890	30,474,900.25	655,474.96	2,691,932.29	5,298,773.93	3,542,013.83	42,663,065.26
1891	31,555,116.85	583,847.16	4,054,822.86	8,256,303.80	4,035,710.15	48,485,800.82
1892	31,961,545.11	557,967.86	10,935,154.69	14,040,187.70	3,636,603.68	61,131,400.04
1893	33,286,167.94	792,470.43	2,247,730.78	6,293,296.33	3,830,176.02	46,443,841.50
1894	38,696,951.40	2,063,615.46	15,614,118.19	12,386,406.81	3,118,421.45	71,909,513.31
1895	44,371,949.83	1,188,258.21	14,108,438.74	2,278,614.07	3,213,809.43	65,161,067.28
1896	53,910,937.02	1,670,005.53	6,572,390.14	3,227,409.06	3,588,622.06	68,769,883.81
1897	60,618,239.77	1,015,314.39	9,371,521.03	13,188,013.86	2,810,248.66	87,003,337.71
1898	69,881,120.57	1,187,682.99	26,477,370.06	47,210,077.84	2,936,943.37	147,693,194.83
1899	76,252,487.23	1,158,307.57	30,336,559.47	32,785,152.48	2,964,683.90	143,497,190.65
1900	87,458,836.23	1,389,066.68	22,720,150.22	18,834,495.33	3,517,540.93	133,920,119.59
1901	92,829,685.86	1,116,179.86	27,189,659.12	27,906,489.13	3,959,656.64	153,101,680.61
Total	1,237,330,049.99	54,079,269.29	327,354,413.15	384,372,020.25	67,205,029.86	2,070,330,782.54

Abundance of currency makes good times and a scarcity of money makes hard times, and every contention that we have made heretofore or are now making for the quantitative the one of money is now admitted, not only by the Secretary of the Treasury, but by all the conditions. Our friends always misunderstood us, and I suppose they did it because they did not get at our real meaning. None of us ever insisted that silver was sacred or that gold was sacred. What we contended was that we did not have enough national money owned and controlled by the Government of the United States itself, and therefore when we coined all the gold and all the silver that could be gotten at our mints that we would still be short. That was our contention.

At the time there was a great scarcity of money. Following that came the greatest gold production that the earth has ever known. As that gold increased in volume business increased, and the year just passed we put more gold into the Treasury than ever went in before since this Government has been in existence. We have to-day \$2.72 per capita more money in circulation than we had even two years ago. We have the largest circulation now that we have ever had since we have been a people. Therefore we have had the best times that we have ever had during the history of the Government.

Mr. HILL. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. BELL. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Do you think that the effect on the prosperity of this country is due solely to the increase of money in this country or to the general increase of money in the world?

Mr. BELL. It has had a greater influence on the general prosperity in this country, and this was supplemented by the fact that we have had such phenomenal crops and such a phenomenal

production of things that foreigners wanted during this special time.

Mr. HILL. Then you think that the prosperity is due to the phenomenal crops rather than to the increase in the circulating medium?

Mr. BELL. The phenomenal crops brought a great deal of this money to our shores.

Mr. HILL. If the increase in money during the last five years in this country has brought such a phenomenal prosperity to the United States, why has not the increase in Germany brought about a like prosperity to Germany?

Mr. BELL. The conditions are entirely different in Germany from a money and from an industrial standpoint.

Mr. HILL. That is what I think.

Mr. BELL. Germany has not had any such increase of money.

Mr. HILL. Oh, yes.

Mr. BELL. No; she has not. Germany has not had mines pouring out money in every conceivable portion of the country. Germany has not had the great productions that we have had in the diversified crops or the exports in other lines; not by any means.

Mr. HILL. After all, is it not the phenomenal crops that we have had that has given us the increase of prosperity, rather than the increase in the circulating medium?

Mr. BELL. The phenomenal crops that we have had have brought us great sums of money, and it has been the money condition and our industrial advantages combined. No one thing ever accounts for a prosperity like ours. I say the war in South Africa has done a great deal for our farmers in this country and for our producers, and all these war conditions—our own war in

the Philippines has done a great deal. But there is no doubt that our great money supply has done much.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman please explain to me, when the per capita circulation in the United States is \$38, and in Austria \$7, and in Belgium \$21, and the British Empire and in Australasia, \$25, and varying from \$2, and \$3, and \$4 in the different countries, where they are immediately adjoining each other in Europe, where the means of getting from one country to the other is so easy, how is it that this prosperity is not going from one to the other under your theory of circulation?

Mr. BELL. Per capita circulation has never been regarded by any economist as any test whatever. The original test, I think was by Calhoun, when the great discussion took place here, and all hands agreed that the per capita circulation did not signify anything except as a test of the quantity of the money of the country, and that you must have your money based upon worth of property to be exchanged. The equilibrium between money and property to be exchanged. A poor, nonprogressive people can absorb but little money.

Mr. HILL. I hope the gentleman will follow that line of argument right up in the next two or three weeks, when we bring in the bill for a set currency, which provides distinctly that there should be a volume of currency in the country to meet the demands of the business required to be done.

Mr. BELL. I would agree with your theory of exchange if you did not put the money in the hands of the banker, but let the Government issue it and control it, so that the bankers could not have the people buy of them and make the bankers prosperous, and leave the people to their misery, at the pleasure of the national-bank associations.

Mr. HILL. I will make a square proposition to the gentleman now: If he will show me any possible way by which the Government can issue any money having any relation to the business of the country I will vote for his proposition.

Mr. BELL. I have just given you Calhoun's views in the matter. There was a means suggested in his day, that the Government could very easily make the equilibrium of, say, \$1 in money to each \$30 in property to be exchanged.

Mr. HILL. How are they going to get it in circulation?

Mr. BELL. There is no trouble about getting money into circulation. This Government pays out millions daily, sells bonds from time to time, and buys money. Money will get in circulation—do not be uneasy—while we run this expensive machine.

Mr. HILL. Except in the payment of debt, how can the Government get money in circulation?

Mr. BELL. There need be no trouble about that. The Government has debts enough to put money in circulation for many years to come, and will always be making them.

Mr. HILL. But the Government of the United States, nor no other government in the world, has any power to put a dollar of money into circulation except by the payment of debts already incurred.

Mr. BELL. I notice that there was no difficulty about getting the greenbacks into circulation and none whatever in getting the Treasury notes into circulation. The banks of this country are trying to destroy every dollar that the Government has now in circulation and are trying to replace it with their own currency, and they may eventually force this Government to pay its debts.

Mr. HILL. With the gentleman's permission, I will ask him to tell me of some way that the United States Government can put one dollar into circulation except paying it on a debt which is already incurred.

Mr. BELL. Why, there is no question but what there are millions of debts annually incurred, and are enough now outstanding to absorb a billion dollars' worth of currency.

Mr. HILL. I am talking about debts already incurred.

Mr. BELL. The Government is making debts all the time. There is no trouble about getting money into circulation with an enterprising Government, but you want to take the money out of circulation.

Mr. COCHRAN. Let me ask the gentleman from Connecticut: Does the Government put money into circulation when it issues, for instance, a large amount of interest-bearing bonds, when they can be exchanged for currency and the currency can be exchanged for bonds? Was it not able to put money into circulation that way?

Mr. HILL. It may if they were to go on issuing bonds.

Mr. COCHRAN. They have done it once; can not they do it now.

Mr. BELL. The coinage of this country is the greatest that this country has ever seen; we have more money than we have ever had before; and I find now, if the newspapers are to be believed, that the same power which is trying to destroy every dollar of Government paper and silver money is going to make its assault on gold. That question was raised twenty years ago. That was the contention in Europe twenty years ago—that they should destroy both gold and silver and have only bank paper.

I say that, in my judgment, the most dangerous thing that ever has come into this House is this banking bill that is before this Chamber at this time. You have here a Secretary of the Treasury, one of the greatest bankers of the land, insisting that the Government stop guaranteeing even the payment of the bank currency. You find him insisting that the banks may issue to the extent of their capital stock, put it upon the market, and it shall be made full legal tender as between citizens.

Mr. HILL. There is no such proposition.

Mr. BELL. It is in the bill itself.

Mr. HILL. There is no such proposition in the bill.

Mr. BELL. I am afraid the gentleman has not read the bill.

Mr. HILL. The gentlemen from Colorado can not have read the bill understandingly and maintain such a proposition.

Mr. BELL. Let us see whether I am right or not. It is idle for our friend or anybody else to insist that this is a dernier ressort.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman show me the proposition where the banking currency is made in this country legal tender between citizens?

Mr. BELL. I make the direct statement that it is provided that these notes they issue for the purpose of redeeming these outstanding obligations shall be a legal tender for all debts, public and private, except the interest on the public debt and import duties.

Mr. HILL. That is not a note issued by the bank at all. That is a United States greenback, and no change is made in the provision of the law. The gentleman himself has not read the bill.

Mr. BELL. Yes, I have read it; and I say there is not a provision in it that is for the people. It is essentially a bankers' bill from beginning to end, and the provisions all show that. Now, here is the provision:

The manner and form of the assumption of the current redemption of the United States notes, as aforesaid, shall be as follows: Each note shall bear the indorsement:

"For value received, the ——— national bank of [city], [State], will currently redeem this note in gold coin until the same has been paid and canceled in accordance with the provisions of law."

Mr. HILL. Is that a bank note?

Mr. BELL. It is.

Mr. HILL. Not at all; it is a United States greenback. If the gentleman will pardon me, I think he has read the bill cursorily. The note to which he refers is the United States note, precisely the same as it is now, in no form or manner changed.

Mr. BELL. You assume these obligations, and you are going to force the people to take them with your indorsement upon them and they become your notes.

Mr. HILL. It is the same greenback that it is now.

Mr. BELL. You agree to assume 130,000,000 of this as your paper, and instead of issuing new obligations you indorse the greenback and send it out, and from that time it becomes your obligation, and it is just the same as though you issued new obligations.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman pardon me? The United States Treasury carries its reserve fund precisely the same as it does now, and the final payment is by the United States the same as it is now. In no way, shape, or manner is it changed in character, quality, or obligation. The only feature of it is that the burden is thrown upon the banks to redeem the obligations instead of compelling the United States Government to do it, but the final obligation is canceled by the Government and the legal obligation rests precisely where it does now without change. As I said before, either the gentleman has not read the bill or else he has read it so hastily that he does not comprehend its purpose.

Mr. BELL. The bill provides that you shall get these obligations on condition that you assume them, what will amount to one hundred and thirty millions of these outstanding obligations. Now, you assume and take from the Government one hundred and thirty millions, and instead of your issuing new obligations you simply provide that you shall assume these old greenbacks and put your indorsement on them, and from that time on you provide that they shall be yours. Why did you put the indorsement on?

Mr. HILL. The taxes go into the Treasury of the United States and then they come out again in payment of these obligations.

That does not change the proposition at all. You are talking about an entirely different subject. What I say is that these greenbacks are now obligations of the Government.

Mr. HILL. They continue so.

Mr. BELL. These greenbacks are now to be redeemed by the Government.

Mr. HILL. Certainly; you are right.

Mr. BELL. They are now legal tender for all debts, public and private, except customs dues and interest on the public debt.

Mr. HILL. And they continue just that way.

Mr. BELL. Yes; this bill provides that you shall assume this obligation, and from that time it shall be your obligation.

Mr. HILL. Not at all.

Mr. BELL. The writer of this bill did not understand that

they would continue to be a legal tender as before, for in the next section it provides that you assume them by your indorsement and they become your obligation as a legal tender. I do not know why you did not leave out that section. Now, let us see how this is:

The manner and form of the assumption of the redemption of the United States note, as aforesaid, shall be as follows: The assumption for value received, the national banks, city or State, will currently redeem until the same has been paid and canceled in accordance with the provisions of law. Any note so indorsed shall be a legal tender "except for import duties and interest on the public debt."

Mr. HILL. The bill does not change the obligation at all.

Mr. BELL. Then why did you put that in?

Mr. HILL. Because there was no change made in the character of the obligation whatever.

Mr. BELL. Why did you make it again a legal tender?

Mr. HILL. We do not. We leave it just as it is.

Mr. BELL. You say it shall be a legal tender.

Mr. HILL. It is now.

Mr. BELL. Why did you put that section in? It stands for nothing if your position is right. My position is that you say to the Government, "You do these things for us, and we will take this burden off of you. Instead of issuing your own paper, we will put this obligation in a certain form." Then you provide that that shall be a legal tender.

A MEMBER. Do you suggest leaving out that clause?

Mr. BELL. No. But I say they made it a legal tender. And I want to say here and now that if the banks of this country are to issue and control the currency, it ought to be absolute legal tender. There ought not to be any of this partial legal-tender money. If the banks are to issue money for this Government, it ought to be full legal tender; it ought to pay all debts, both public and private. I do not know why the bondholders should not take this obligation the same as anybody else. There may be some reason why the import duties might be required to be paid in something else; but I do not see why a man who holds a Government bond should be a favored creditor of this nation except as regards bonds already outstanding.

We have given hundreds of millions already to these bondholders. They are pets of this Government. Since I have been a member of this House I have seen a message come here from the President of the United States saying to you and to me that if we would put into one sale of these bonds a provision that they should be paid in gold he could save over \$16,000,000 in the issuing of such bonds. I saw that and you saw it. The Republicans on this floor and the Democrats, too, stood up and said, "We can not afford to make our bonds all payable in gold, and if we make one class payable in gold absolutely the obligation will be extended to all the others."

Mr. Cleveland insisted that the insertion of such a clause would make a difference in the value of these bonds payable in gold as compared with those simply payable in coin—a difference of a little more than \$16,000,000. We said we would pay the \$16,000,000. Immediately the bondholder purchased them as silver bonds at a reduced price of \$16,000,000, and now the Treasury Department is treating those bonds as gold obligations. This is a gift of \$16,000,000, and if it was some one that was having a little transaction with the Government, why they would chase him by the month for a little wash bill. Those fellows walk off with over \$16,000,000 of the Government money.

Now, I am not prejudiced against banks and bankers, but I want to say they have got this Government by the throat, and they are trying to get a new hold on it, and the great banks of this country are getting now Government money worth nearly \$8,000 a day for nothing. No ordinary citizen can get it. If this bill is passed I want to say good-bye to American industrial independence. Anybody that wants good investments must get in a big bank; he must not get in a little one, because the little banks will be crushed and go out of existence as these mighty institutions spread.

I have detained you longer than I expected or should have done, and I want to say in regard to these three bills, when these gentlemen bring them up for hearing, I will not get a chance to discuss them, you will not get a chance to discuss them; they will be whipped through here without discussion and without amendment, and while I often hear it said that there is never a time when the House can not overrule the Speaker, I say that that may be technically so, but it is not really so.

Mr. HILL. You do not object, do you, to the Government putting upon the banks the burden of paying one hundred and thirty millions of greenbacks, do you, and so relieving the Government from so much indebtedness?

Mr. BELL. I do, at the price the banks demand.

Mr. HILL. I do not know what that price is.

Mr. BELL. The price is that you shall turn over the destiny of this great country to the banks of the country.

Mr. HILL. That is a feature of the bill that I have not seen yet.

Mr. BELL. Well, I think you will find the opinion of the people. I want to be a banker if this bill ever passes.

Mr. HILL. There is not any earthly reason, if you have the capital to put up, why you should not be a banker now.

Mr. BELL. But I would not get in a little bank, because your object is to destroy the little banks. It will be the gigantic institutions that will spread their tentacles into every village in this country and wipe out the little banks or make them mere servants of the great central institutions, and these other banks will not have the assets upon which to issue the capital. The great institutions will be the ones to issue the capital and hire it out to the little banks. God forbid that such a nefarious act may be fastened upon this people.

Mr. SPIGHT. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to address myself to the pending bill, but to submit some remarks in connection with the resolution which it is understood is soon to be reported by the Committee on Rules providing for the appointment of a committee, nominally to investigate and report upon the question of the abridgment of the right of suffrage under the constitution and laws of any State in the Union, but really to be confined in its operations to certain Southern States in which the intelligent, virtuous, and property-holding classes have sought by peaceable and lawful methods to minimize the danger resulting from conferring political power upon ignorance, vice, and worthlessness.

I take advantage of this opportunity in general debate to submit some remarks on this resolution, because it is understood that when it is reported to the House the time for debate will be limited perhaps to twenty minutes on a side, which would amount practically to no time at all.

The purpose of this resolution is ostensibly to reduce the representation of these proscribed States on the floor of this House and in the electoral college on the specious pretense of love for and obedience to the Constitution of the United States. And yet the political party which is pushing this scheme is the party which has so often in recent years, and during the present session of Congress, shown its utter disregard for the Constitution, and has ruthlessly trampled under foot some of the most sacred provisions of that instrument, which underlie the very foundations of our free institutions. Therefore I fear that it is not love and reverence for the Constitution which prompts this movement, but an unholy desire to win political advantage. [Applause on Democratic side.]

I am glad that many of the more conservative and thoughtful members of the Republican party have deprecated this effort to stir up the fast-dying embers of sectional strife and ill-will. I am glad that the spirit of the lamented McKinley still lives in the breasts of some of the men in the party of which he was so conspicuous a leader. From that great, loving, kindly, Christian heart of his there went out a note which was akin to the song of the heavenly choir announcing to the wondering shepherds in the hills of Judea the greatest event of all the ages, "Unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord." \* \* \*. On earth peace, good will toward men." McKinley said, "Let the South alone," and not only held out an olive branch, but he had nothing but kind words for our people. I shall always be glad that in his long ride across the continent in the year of his death he passed through our country and gave to our people an opportunity to show their appreciation of his noble efforts to eradicate sectional bitterness, allay sectional strife, and bring about a complete reconciliation between all the people of this glorious country, reunited not in name alone but in spirit also.

Much as we differed from him on some great questions of governmental policy, we believed *then* and we know *now* that during his four years at the head of the National Administration McKinley did more to accomplish these beneficent purposes than any man who has lived since the close of the great war. [Applause.] Then it is not strange that his tragic death came to us as a personal bereavement. He was our friend and he had the manliness to tell us so, notwithstanding we had never voted for him, and he had the tact to do it in a manner not to offend, and to convince us of his sincerity. Nowhere in all this broad land of ours were found more sincere mourners than in the South when the news flashed over the wires and was telegraphed from heart to heart that his gentle spirit had taken its flight from earth forever. I wish that more of his love of fairness and grandeur of purpose might find lodgment in the breasts of the leaders of the Republican party of to-day.

I am glad we have reached a point in our history when we hear less of "rebels and Yankees" and more of America and Americans, and I hope soon to see the glad day when the Northern leaders of public sentiment are enabled to understand that Southern men of equally high character with themselves know more of the vexing problems which endanger the social and business interests of their section, and know better how to deal with them

than their brethren of other parts of the country who have not had the same opportunities for reaching correct conclusions with reference to these peculiar matters. There is no "negro problem" in the South if we can only be let alone in the management of our domestic affairs. The negro is happier, more content, and more generally prosperous than he has ever been since, by the proclamation by President Lincoln, he was declared to be a free man. That the conferring upon him of the elective franchise in his then condition was a great mistake has been long since conceded by many of the greatest and most patriotic thinkers of the Republican party.

But let us look further into the ultimate purposes of the advocates of this proscriptive legislation. I have no fears that the party in power will at this session of Congress reduce the representation of any State. In Congressional districts and in States where the negroes hold the balance of power the Republican candidates in the elections next fall may hope to win victories for themselves by singing a siren song of love to their black allies, but where there are few negroes and their votes unimportant the Republican candidates will not want to be handicapped by the accomplished fact of having reduced, for purely partisan reasons, the representation of any State and with the ghost of a force bill looming up on the horizon of the near future. This is especially true in such States as Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee.

If it were not that there still is truth in the heathen adage, "whom the gods would destroy they first make mad," I would not believe that this contemplated legislation would ever be enacted, and it may yet be that cooler and more conservative counsels will prevail, and there will be nothing but the miserable farce of a pretended investigation without any results except injury to the material interests of a people who are striving grandly to rebuild their waste places, advance along the lines of industrial and commercial progress, and preserve their magnificent civilization. But if the advocates of this repression should triumph over conservatism and should conclude that the people will endure it, their next step will be something in the nature of a force bill, with United States marshals around the polling places at Federal elections, and then that which is said to have broken loose in Georgia will be to pay.

In discussing this proposition to reduce representation in certain Southern States I shall undertake to do so under four subdivisions:

- First. The impracticability of the scheme.
- Second. The want of constitutional power on the part of Congress to deal with the question.
- Third. The effect of such action upon the business interests of the whole country, and
- Fourth. The effect upon the States subjected to such punitive legislation.

Under the first head I wish to call attention to the fact that there is no sufficient data upon which to base the contemplated action. Before there can be any intelligent and honest effort to reduce representation because of the denial or abridgment of the right of suffrage in any State there must be not only an ascertainment of the number of males over 21 years of age who are disfranchised, but the causes of such disfranchisement must also be shown.

Denial of the right to vote, which might result in reduction of representation under the provisions of section 2 of Article XIV of the Federal Constitution, can not be applied where the denial is a part of the punishment inflicted for the commission of crime. Every State is the sole judge as to what should constitute crime within its own jurisdiction, with the single limitation that such State laws shall not conflict with any provision of the Constitution of the United States. In Mississippi there are thousands who are denied the right to vote on account of the commission of crime, independent of other disqualifying causes, and yet there is no information available to Congress or reasonably to an investigating committee as to the number thus disfranchised.

A committee could ascertain the number now in the State penitentiary, and by examining the records of all the courts in every county could find the number in the jails and undergoing punishment in the hands of contractors for convict labor. This would be a long and expensive undertaking, and yet it would not furnish half the necessary information. There are thousands of others who have suffered their penalties, been discharged from custody, and are scattered all over the country, and who are still and forever disqualified from voting.

Again, it will be practically impossible to ascertain how many who have not registered as voters are disqualified for any reason and how many are not. Some whites and many negroes who could qualify fail to do so because of want of interest in political affairs.

Not half the white men in Mississippi whose names appear on the registration books vote in general elections, because, under

our system of nomination by primary election, when a Democratic candidate is indorsed by his party the contest is ended, and only a fractional part of the Democratic and practically none of the Republican vote is polled at the general election. The advocates of this punitive legislation realize the insurmountable difficulties in the way of obtaining information necessary for intelligent action and propose to take as a basis of their calculations the vote actually polled in Congressional elections. One of the zealous supporters of this scheme, in a communication to the Washington Post a few days ago, takes the Congressional Directory as his guide, and compares the vote of Mississippi, by districts, with the vote of New York. Either ignorantly or corruptly he ignores the fact that in Mississippi there was no contest, and not one-third of the registered vote was polled, while in New York there was a hot fight, and practically all the votes on both sides were brought out.

No man on this floor who has any regard for truth and fairness will say that because all the qualified electors do not exercise their right to vote the State shall be punished by reducing its representation to that extent. There is no power under any constitution or statute that can compel a man to vote. The privilege is conferred under certain conditions, but its exercise is a purely voluntary act and can not be made compulsory. To reduce a State's representation because some of her citizens who are eligible as electors do not see proper to register and vote would be a monstrous and inexcusable crime against the sovereignty of the State and a flagrant and willful violation of the very clause of the Constitution which the friends of this measure profess to be so anxious to uphold. As I said in a speech delivered in the Fifty-sixth Congress on this subject, there must be another census, with specially prepared questions, before any such information can be obtained that would justify Congress to undertake the enforcement of this resolution.

Mr. PALMER. Suppose the facts can be ascertained, are you willing then to have your representation reduced?

Mr. SPIGHT. We are not willing, I will say in answer to that question, to surrender the rights the surrender of which has not been demanded from other States. I will say to the gentleman before I get through that as a last resort we would not only concede the right to reduce our representation, or the power to reduce our representation, but we would rather give it all up, and without any representation at all in this House, than to return again to the state of affairs existing in the reconstruction period, from 1869 to 1876.

Under my second subdivision I deny that Congress has the Constitutional power to deal with this question as now presented, but it is one for the Supreme Court first to determine. If any State, by its constitutional or statutory enactments, has violated any section or clause of the Federal Constitution this is not the forum in which that violation shall be declared; but it is a question which must be heard, tried, and determined in the judicial tribunal constituted for that purpose; and whenever that great court shall declare that the organic or statute law of a State is in conflict with any provision of the Constitution of the United States, then such State must modify its own enactments to conform to the decision of the court or suffer the penalties imposed.

The first section of the fourteenth amendment declares that "all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside;" but mere citizenship does not confer the right to vote. One must be a citizen before the privilege of the elective franchise can be bestowed, but this is not enough. Every woman and child born or naturalized in the United States is a citizen, but not a voter. The United States can make citizens but it can not make qualified voters. This latter power belongs only to the States, without any Federal limitations except that prescribed in the fifteenth amendment that "the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." Subject to this restriction alone, the States have complete jurisdiction of the whole question of suffrage.

In the case of the *United States v. Cruikshanks* (92 U. S., 542), the Supreme Court says:

The Constitution has not conferred the right of suffrage upon anyone, and the United States have no voters of their own creation in the States. The fifteenth amendment has invested the citizens of the United States with a new constitutional right, which is exemption from discrimination in the exercise of the elective franchise on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The right of suffrage is not a necessary attribute of national citizenship. The right to vote in the States comes from the States, but the right of exemption from the prohibited discrimination comes from the United States. The first has not been granted or secured by the Constitution of the United States; but the last has been.

In *Barbier v. Connolly* (113 U. S., 237), in speaking of the fourteenth amendment, it is said:

Class legislation, discrimination against some and favoring others, is prohibited; but legislation which, in carrying out a public purpose, if within

the sphere of its operation it affects alike all persons similarly situated, is not within the amendment.

In *McPherson v. Blacker* (146 U. S., 1) it is declared that—

Neither the Constitution nor the fourteenth amendment made all citizens voters.

In *Williams v. Mississippi* (170 U. S., 213), which was an appeal from a decision of the supreme court of Mississippi holding that the constitution of 1890 was not in conflict with any clause of the Federal Constitution, one of the assignments of error was that the State constitution denied or abridged the right to vote, and that the representation in Congress had not been reduced in consequence thereof, thus presenting the very question sought to be raised by this resolution, and the Supreme Court of the United States, in a unanimous opinion, said: "The constitution and statutes of Mississippi do not on their face discriminate between the races," and the decision of the Mississippi court was affirmed. Thus it is shown that the constitution of Mississippi has been tested and sustained in the supreme courts of both the State and the United States. I will read the two sections of the present constitution of Mississippi upon which assaults have been made and which were considered by the court in the *Williams* case, from which I have just quoted:

SEC. 241. Every male inhabitant of this State except idiots, etc., \* \* \* 21 years old and upwards, who has resided in this State two years, and one year in the election district \* \* \* and who is duly registered \* \* \* and who has not been convicted of bribery, burglary, theft, arson, obtaining money by false pretenses, perjury, forgery, embezzlement, or bigamy, and who has paid, on or before the 1st day of February in the year in which he shall offer to vote, all taxes which may have been required of him \* \* \* is declared to be a qualified elector.

Section 244 contains the "understanding clause" about which so much has been heard, and reads as follows:

On and after the 1st day of January, 1892, every elector shall, in addition to the foregoing qualifications, be able to read any section of the constitution of this State, or he shall be able to understand the same when read to him, or give a reasonable interpretation thereof.

These sections do not deny the right of suffrage to anyone, but merely prescribe qualifications, which when summed up stand for good citizenship and some degree of intelligence. They shut out the ignorant, the vicious, the criminals, and those who, from worthlessness or disinclination, contribute nothing toward the support of the Government which protects them in their persons and property and furnishes the money to educate their children. For this the State is threatened with punishment by reducing our representation in Congress.

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. SPIGHT. Certainly.

Mr. PALMER. If you have in fact excluded any portion of your population from exercising the right of suffrage, do you think they ought to be represented?

Mr. SPIGHT. The policy of the Government has been to base representation on population, and all ought to be represented. The Government is for the protection of all the people and for their benefit and not merely for those who vote, and I believe it is right that the representation should be based upon population rather than upon the number of those who should see proper to exercise the elective franchise.

Mr. PALMER. Then you ought to repeal the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. SPIGHT. Well, sir, the party to which I belong is not responsible for the grafting of that amendment upon the Constitution; and whenever your party see proper to propose to repeal it, then we would be willing to vote with you on that.

Mr. PALMER. Is not the fourteenth amendment just as much a part of the Constitution as any other section? And ought it not to be enforced as much as any other section, as long as it is a part of the Constitution?

Mr. SPIGHT. Yes. And we are not violating it either, and do not intend to; and if we do, whenever it is shown to us by competent authority that we have violated it we are willing to bow to the decision of the court.

Mr. PALMER. As I understand it, that is exactly the purpose of this committee—to find out whether you have violated it or whether you are violating it—and you gentlemen object to a fair investigation.

Mr. SPIGHT. The Supreme Court of the United States has said that the Mississippi constitution is not in conflict with any clause of the Federal Constitution, and whenever they say that we are violating the Constitution of the United States we will bow to that decision, but we do not in advance propose to concede that we are doing that thing.

A number of Northern States have provisions very much like these and have had for years, but no effort has been made to reduce their representation.

While the Supreme Court of the United States has never directly decided the question, it is held by many of the ablest lawyers and most profound thinkers of this country that the adoption of the fifteenth amendment had the effect of abrogating the puni-

tive clause of the second section of the fourteenth amendment, and among this number was James G. Blaine, one of the most brilliant men of his generation, a great leader of the Republican party, and with an intense anti-Southern feeling.

In his book, *Twenty Years in Congress*, speaking of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments and the effect of the one upon the other, he uses this language:

When the nation, by subsequent change in its Constitution, declared that the State shall not exclude the negro from the right of suffrage, it neutralized and surrendered the contingent right as heretofore held to exclude him from the basis of apportionment. Congress is thus plainly deprived by the fifteenth amendment of certain powers over representation in the South which it previously possessed under the fourteenth amendment. Before the adoption of the fifteenth amendment if a State should exclude the negro from suffrage, the next step would be for Congress to exclude the negro from the basis of apportionment. After the adoption of the fifteenth amendment if a State should exclude the negro from suffrage, the next step would be for the Supreme Court to declare that the act was unconstitutional and therefore null and void.

But Mr. Blaine expressed the opinion that the first, third, and fourth sections of the fourteenth amendment were not affected by the adoption of the fifteenth amendment. So that, in the estimation of this eminent authority, this question is not one for a partisan Congress to determine, but is one for the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. In further answer to the gentleman's question I wish to suggest that as eminent an authority as Judge Cooley has said, in his *Principles of Constitutional Law*, that an educational qualification is not an abridgment of the suffrage; that a tax qualification is not an abridgment of the suffrage; that a thing in order to be an abridgment of the suffrage must cut it entirely off, but that a qualification such that a man may equip himself for suffrage is not an abridgment, and he refers to several Supreme Court decisions in support of that proposition.

Mr. SPIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to refer to that authority also, but I shall adopt the language of my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] and will leave that branch of the subject.

Whatever may be said as to the validity of what is known as "the grandfather clause" in some of the recently adopted State constitutions, the discussion of which I shall leave to gentlemen whose States are affected thereby, the constitution of Mississippi has stood the test, and there is no longer any question as to its validity. The third proposition which I propose to discuss briefly is the effect of the agitation of this question upon the business interests of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say that the time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SPIGHT] has expired.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have leave to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi be allowed to conclude his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPIGHT. I am much obliged to the gentleman for his kindness.

With the freedom from political disturbances which has prevailed for several years, the South is advancing more rapidly along industrial lines than any other part of this country. Labor is becoming more settled. The negro, instead of looking to politics as his chief end, is devoting himself to raising corn and cotton and providing the necessities of life for his family, and striving for a home of his own. The enormous value of our agricultural products, our coal and iron fields, our gushing oil wells, our forests of valuable timber, and our rapidly growing manufacturing interests of various kinds, together with our salubrious and semitropical climate, and with fuel and water for the motive power of machinery in sight of the raw products for feeding the factories, have attracted Northern and Eastern capitalists, and they have invested millions of dollars in Southern enterprises; and under wise and beneficent policies there is no limit to the possibilities of the South in progress and development. It would be superfluous for me to say that the greater the prosperity of the South the more abundant the wealth of the whole country.

It is also a self-evident fact that when disturbing causes contribute to retarding the growth and development of the South the great centers of trade are injuriously affected. It is of almost, if not quite, as much moment to the business interests of the North and East as to the South to avoid every disturbing element which would tend toward checking our development and the unsettling of property values. Everything which has a tendency to stir up strife, alienate labor, and create distrust in the minds of capitalists is a menace to the business interests of the country which every patriotic citizen desires to prevent. Gentlemen who favor this repressive legislation for partisan purposes and political advantage will find, when it may be too late, that the sober business sense in every section of the country will condemn it as unwise, unpatriotic, and hurtful.

The last proposition to which I shall address myself is the effect which the contemplated action would have upon the States to which it is intended to apply. Nobody on either side of this question believes that it is the purpose to interfere with any but Southern States, and in considering this last branch of the subject I shall speak of it as it will affect Mississippi, and I believe that the same conditions will be found to exist in a large measure in all the other proscribed States.

While the language of our constitution is so carefully guarded as to prevent its conflict with the fifteenth amendment, I will not deny that the leading purpose was to eliminate the negro from the political equation, and no honest man who has any conception of the horrors of the reconstruction period can blame us. None but those who suffered as we did can understand what we had to endure in the fateful years from 1869 to 1876. Our homes were desolated, our fields were only waste places, our property was gone, and our magnificent civilization was threatened. The hungry carpetbagger, without conscience or decency, the synonym of rapine and plunder, had invaded our land and desecrated the high stations once occupied by our fathers. Attila, the Hun, was called the "scourge of God;" the carpetbagger was, in fact, the scourge of the devil.

A black horde, whose dense ignorance was only equalled by their credulity, were the willing tools of their unscrupulous leaders and rejoiced in the power to oppress and humiliate the white people of the State. Imagine, if you can, what the intelligent and virtuous people of any Northern State would feel if they should be compelled to look into the office of their chief executive and see a man posing as governor, an alien and a stranger, without a dollar's worth of property in the State, and without a spark of sympathy for the people over whom he was called to rule. Then turn to the legislative halls and find them filled with the most ignorant and depraved class in the Commonwealth, reveling in a saturnalia of plunder, and assuming to make laws of which they have no conception save that they are intended to put "black heels on white necks," and then tell me, if you dare, that the people would stand it.

All this and more we have seen, and the only wonder is that we bore it so long. At last when "forbearance had ceased to be a virtue" delivery from these hateful and ruinous conditions could only be accomplished in one of two ways. Either there must be open violence and bloodshed, or the more peaceful method of the tissue ballot must be resorted to. Driven to desperation as were our people, I do not deny that, for a time, election frauds were practiced, and the only apology, if any I should make, which I have to offer is, that it was that or worse, and I am not ashamed to say that under the same conditions we would do it again. But for many years elections in Mississippi have been as free from fraud as in any State in this Union.

Notwithstanding two disastrous crop seasons in succession our people are forging ahead, and though our farmers are much depressed by their failures in the last two years, with the courage which has always characterized Mississippians they enter upon this new year with renewed hope and confidence. As I have said before, the negro is more contented than he has ever been since his emancipation, and his pretended white friends can do him no greater harm than to hold out to him again the tempting bauble of political activity. It will demoralize him as laborer, wage-earner, and wealth producer and will strike a deadly blow at all prosperity. No better advice can be given than to say "let the negro alone." The white people are paying for the education of his children, and he knows it. He is on terms of friendship with the dominant classes and his rights are as well protected as in any State in the Union, and all he has to do is to be a law-abiding and industrious citizen and he will command the respect and good will of the white people, who are his best friends. Nothing but harm can come from filling his mind again with political ideas. He is emotional in the highest degree and is easily carried away by blind, unreasoning enthusiasm, and it would be an easy task for a shrewd, designing, and unscrupulous white man to make him believe that he is an important political factor and so poison his mind as to unfit him for the ordinary and profitable duties of life.

If it is imagined by the advocates of this resolution that the threat which it conveys, or the actual reduction of our representation, will compel our people to change our suffrage laws, they are laboring under a gross delusion. It will never be done. We would rather have no representation in Congress than to have ignorance, vice, and corruption restored to political power in our State government.

We still have in the South the truest and noblest type of Anglo-Saxon civilization to be found in the world, and we intend to preserve it at all hazards. We received it in a halo of glory from our fathers, and we intend to transmit it untarnished to our children. We love honor and true manhood. We admire courage and patriotic devotion to duty wherever found. We despise

hypocrisy and condemn a coward. We love our State and all her interests and are proud of her achievements in field and forum.

The sanctity of our homes and the purity of our beauteous womanhood are far dearer to us than life itself, and these can be cherished, fostered, and protected only under a white man's government; and this we will maintain with "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." You may shear us of our political power, if you will, but we will still have left the proud consciousness of knowing that we are right; that our homes and our loved ones are protected, and our local governments remain in our own hands; and trusting to Him who rules nations and peoples, and waiting for the returning sense of justice, and believing that the American people will yet do right, we will "run with patience the race that is set before us," and in the light of our Christian civilization solve every problem as it arises. [Loud applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Just one word. Is the gentleman from Missouri in his seat?

Mr. BENTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. We have had one hour and you have had the balance of the day. How much additional time does my friend require?

Mr. BENTON. Well, so far as I know fifty minutes covers all the time I have promised; and if there is no other gentleman on that side to speak, why we can get through by 5 o'clock.

Mr. CANNON. Then I will ask unanimous consent that we close general debate when we adjourn to-day.

Mr. BENTON. I see no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that general debate upon this bill close with to-day's session. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I suggest if the gentleman can take care of me in the morning, if I have no time between now and 5 o'clock, I shall have no objection.

Mr. BENTON. You can protect yourself under the five-minute rule by obtaining an extension.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Chairman, I make the usual apology in submitting these remarks. I apologize because I shall not discuss the bill under consideration; but it would seem that an apology is hardly necessary, inasmuch as it appears to be the custom of this House to discuss the merits of one measure while some other measure is being considered. It is not deemed improper to discuss, for instance, the tariff when the Indian appropriation bill is under consideration. Bills about which there is an honest difference of opinion are rushed through almost without debate, while ample time for discussion is permitted when bills about which there is no contest are considered. Fortunately there is, I am told, no rule of the House requiring gentlemen to confine their remarks to the subject under consideration. This strikes the new member as being a little peculiar, but we are told that this is one of the great liberties permitted by the Reed rules.

Now, in the exercise of my right as an American Representative, I saw fit the other day to introduce certain resolutions requiring the Speaker to appoint a select committee of 13, whose duty it shall be to investigate the corrupt use of money in elections by all the great political parties. These resolutions have been misrepresented to such an extent by the Republican press of the country that I feel constrained to submit some remarks.

The reply of the Republican press is threefold. They say, first, that I am proposing to investigate the use of money by the Republican party only, and that the resolutions are therefore unfair. Those who charge this certainly did not read the resolutions.

The word "Republican" is not used. They would inaugurate an investigation of the use of money by the national committees of all the great political parties offering candidates for President in the years 1896 and 1900. Why the Republican press should distort the resolutions I can not imagine, unless it is prompted to do so by a consciousness of the guilt of its own party. Secondly, this partisan press has attempted a little ridicule which is indeed crushing. It suggests that I am a new member. My reply is that I came here just as soon as I could get here. [Laughter.] Thirdly, it suggests that I am a member of unimportant committees. I deny this; but if it be true, a Republican Speaker is responsible, and not myself. [Laughter.] All this, Mr. President, will not prevent honest men, thinking men, from giving the resolutions some consideration.

How is it that this House is about to enter into an investigation of the affairs of the States? What has provoked the resolutions of the gentleman from Indiana? I can only speak for my own State. It is not necessary to go further back than the year 1894. During that year two parties, professedly opposite in principles, united to carry our State. One favored the free coinage of silver, while the other was committed to the gold standard. One favored the subtreasury project, while the other favored the national banks.

One favored the Government ownership of railroads, while the other favored the railroad ownership of government. And there were other radical differences between these two parties, but all that made no difference. Offices they wanted and offices they intended to have. So they divided out all the offices, except the electors for President. Their leaders even went so far as to calculate the emoluments of the numerous offices parceled out in order that the division might be just and fair. This is not a jest, Mr. Chairman, but a melancholy truth. On election day, in compliance with their programme, 50,000 white men walked to the ballot box by the side of more than 100,000 negroes, and decent government was overthrown in the State.

It gives me pleasure to admit that some men in both these parties repudiated this unnatural alliance, and that most of those who did repudiate it helped us to redeem the State in 1898. What was the result? What offspring was born to this union? As I love my State, I hesitate to make this admission. As I am proud of her history, I am ashamed for the world to hear it. The result of this fusion enabled more than 900 incompetent negroes—some of them vicious, very many of them venal—to occupy positions of trust or profit in our good old State from 1894 to 1898.

There was incompetency almost everywhere. Public virtue was ridiculed. There were many rumors of scandal in high places. Bills were put upon the statute books which never passed either house of the general assembly. The negro, by nature kind, became insolent. Our wives and our daughters walked the streets of some of our largest towns in the broad day time in constant fear of negro insults. During these few moments I can give you but a faint idea of the humiliation of our good old State.

In 1898 the white men of North Carolina united and swept these people from power. In 1900 they boldly, openly adopted an amendment to their constitution which renders a repetition of this condition forever impossible. I have not the time to-day, Mr. Chairman, to discuss the constitutionality of that amendment. We believe it will be sustained by the courts. We do not believe that by law the Republican majority in the House has any right to reduce our representation here. But we have done what we have done.

If the law of the land requires a reduction in our representation in this House we will submit to it. I undertake to say there is not a Democratic member from our State who would not willingly give up his seat if it were necessary to save our State from the curse of negro rule. If you wish to punish us for protecting our homes, do your worst. We defy you. We shall appeal from the blind partisan here to our patriotic and sympathetic white brother in all the States of the Union. Think you this appeal will be in vain?

But, Mr. Chairman, while they are proposing to investigate, I thought it would be a good idea to propose an additional investigation. Let us ascertain, if we can, something about the corrupt use of money in our national elections. While you are investigating the legal suppression of the negro vote in the South, suppose you investigate the purchase of white votes in other sections. It is a matter of common knowledge that large funds are raised and distributed in every campaign by the Republican party. It is charged, and not denied, that this corruption fund (for it can have no other correct name) in 1896 amounted to millions. It has been charged that the Republican national chairman raised \$600,000 in one city, and more than a million in another. Of course this can not be proven without the aid of the law.

I do not undertake to say the statement is true, but it is believed to be true by many an honest man in this country. One of the editorials in a Republican paper, which misrepresented my resolutions (as the editor has since admitted), uses these words: "It is the common belief that far too much money is spent in our political campaigns. It is a growing evil, and many men deplore it." When a Republican paper makes this admission, Mr. Chairman, you may rest assured that a very grave evil exists. Whether true or false, there is a belief entertained by many a good man that the Presidency of this great Republic goes to the party who can raise the greatest corruption fund. Let us illustrate.

Suppose, in 1904, the Republican party shall name its candidate, supply its national chairman with unlimited means, as was said to be the case in 1896, and suppose the Democratic party shall name its candidate, and its national chairman shall only be supplied with enough money to defray the legitimate expenses of the campaign, which candidate do you suppose will win? Now, reverse the proposition. Give the Democratic national chairman plenty of money and the Republican chairman little or none. How do you think doubtful States will go?

Do you think, Mr. Chairman, that there would be very much Republican money put up on their candidate? The parties are so equally divided that a few doubtful States generally decide the election. How utterly abominable the practice of pouring money like water into these doubtful States to corrupt their votes! How utterly horrible this quadrennial contest between campaign

funds! If my party is guilty, let us turn on the lights. Let us investigate, and if these rumors be true which we constantly hear, let us do something to put an end to the practice forever.

We sometimes hear men suggest that the Republic is in danger. Most of this is idle talk. But, Mr. Chairman, there is one real danger; there is one ever-present menace to liberty. It overhangs our beloved country like a black cloud. It is the corruption of the American electorate by the use of money. Neither party can justify the practice by charging that the other party is guilty. It never has been right to "fight the devil with fire." Gentlemen can not evade the responsibility. No man should be willing for his party to do that which he would not do himself.

For one, Mr. Chairman, I prefer a repression of partisan strife. Rancor and partisan bitterness are to be deplored at all times. Let us look beyond our own State, our own section, and embrace within our loyalty and our love every inch of this Republic. Let the gentleman from Indiana be warned that no good can come of his investigation, but much harm. Let him be warned that it will open up strife in a land now prosperous and peaceful. It might be well for him to ask himself whether there is any demand for the passage of his resolutions. But if his party shall insist upon an investigation let it proceed to correct, if possible, the very greatest of all our national evils.

Mr. Chairman, it remains to be seen what will be done with the resolutions I have seen fit to introduce. They have been referred to the Committee on Rules. That committee is all-powerful, but the resolutions will not be reported. They will sleep, because, if adopted, they will expose such practices as will render a continuance of the power of the Republican party hereafter impossible. [Loud applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, on page 58 of this bill I find a provision which I intend to take as a text for a few remarks, which I will make as broad and philosophical as I can, concerning its general significance and concerning the general significance of conditions of the sort sought to be met by it throughout the world. This provision is for the enforcement of the Chinese-exclusion act.

Enforcement of the Chinese exclusion act: To prevent unlawful entry of Chinese into the United States, by the appointment of suitable officers to enforce the laws in relation thereto, and for expenses of returning to China all Chinese persons found to be unlawfully in the United States, including the cost of imprisonment and actual expense of conveyance of Chinese persons to the frontier or seaboard for deportation, \$200,000, of which sum \$1,000 per annum shall be paid to the collector of customs at Port Townsend as additional compensation and \$1,000 per annum shall be paid to the Commissioner-General of Immigration as additional compensation.

As an American citizen, as a Democrat, as a student of ethnology, I am emphatically in favor of that provision. I am emphatically in favor of every provision and every law which attempts at any hazard to secure to the Republic a homogeneity of population. I am in favor of every provision that would keep a white man's country his in its civilization, in its code of ethics, and in its government, and conversely of every law and policy that would restrain the white man in his own country and keep him from superimposing himself upon the black man, the yellow man, or the brown man in his country.

I will show you before I am through that in what I say I am expressing no narrow prejudice, no sectional view, but a conclusion at which white men have always arrived—men of our race—when they are confronted by a situation which demands any race conclusion at all.

Mr. Chairman, the feeling of the white race which leads it to try to guard itself from the infringement of other races, and which leads it to regard the amassing of any considerable number of any other race in its midst as a menace to its civilization and to its very life, is a feeling which has caused much argument concerning its source. Some people contend that it is an instinct; other people argue that it is a prejudice. I care not which it is; it is a fact, which has existed always under circumstances calling for its assertion, and which always will exist.

I do not myself think that it is an instinct, because I find little children not sharing it. I do not think it is a prejudice, because prejudice is a conclusion founded unreasonably and without cause. I would rather define it to be a common-sense, historical, induction and just conclusion, arrived at from being confronted with an actual condition. It has existed everywhere.

Early in the history of this country it existed in the anti-red man form in Massachusetts. All the early epistolary literature of New England is full of the idea, of white people, being the Israel of God, contending against red men, as Gentiles and Philistines, and Hittites and Amalekites. It exists in Arizona and New Mexico in the anti-Digger form. It exists on the Pacific slope in the anti-Chinese form. It exists in South Africa in the anti-Kaffir form. It exists down South, though not as strongly as elsewhere, in the anti-negro form.

It has gone down South only to the point of resenting any effort to bring the negroes to a social and political equality. It does not exist there industrially. It is everywhere else on the surface of

the globe a resentment against collaborating with the white man even. There have been some few exceptions upon limited areas in the Tropics, but wherever the exceptions have existed they have been followed by hybridizations, by loss of self-respect among men and women—the latter chiefly—by race deterioration, and by loss of manhood.

Now, gentlemen, I said that I would promise to show you that this feeling is not a feeling of mere prejudice, but is the common-sense conclusion of wise men when confronted with a situation. I want to read you a few lines from Abraham Lincoln, whom my people at one time hated perhaps as they hated no other man—a man whom the student of history learns to respect more and more from day to day as a man of broad charity and a very considerable degree of philosophy; marvelous, indeed, considering his preparation and education. Here is what he said in the general debate with Mr. Douglass in 1858:

Now, gentlemen, I do not want to read at any greater length, but this is the true complexion of all I have ever said in regard to the institution of slavery and the black race. This is the whole of it, and anything that argues me into his idea of perfect social and political equality with the negro is but a specious and fantastic arrangement of words, by which a man can prove a horse-chestnut to be a chestnut horse. I will say here, while upon this subject, that I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so. I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and black races. There is a physical difference between the two which, in my judgment, will probably forever forbid their living together upon the footing of perfect equality, and, inasmuch as it becomes a necessity that there must be a difference, I, as well as Judge Douglas, am in favor of the race to which I belong having the superior position. \* \* \*

Judge Douglas has said to you that he has not been able to get from me an answer to the question whether I am in favor of negro citizenship. So far as I know, the judge never asked me such a question before. He shall have no occasion to ever ask it again, for I tell him very frankly that I am not in favor of negro citizenship. This furnishes me an occasion for saying a few words upon the subject. I mentioned, in a certain speech of mine which has been printed, that the Supreme Court had decided that a negro could not possibly be made a citizen, and, without saying what was my ground of complaint in regard to that or whether I had any grounds of complaint, Judge Douglas has from that thing manufactured nearly everything that he ever says about my disposition to produce an equality between the negroes and white people.

If anyone will read my speech he will find I mentioned that as one of the points decided in the course of the Supreme Court opinions, but I did not state what objection I had to it. But Judge Douglas tells the people what my objection was, when I did not tell them myself. Now, my opinion is that the different States have the power to make a negro a citizen under the Constitution of the United States, if they choose. The Dred Scott decision decides that they have not that power. If the State of Illinois had that power I should be opposed to the exercise of it. That is all I have to say about it.

Before proceeding let me say I think I have no prejudice against the Southern people. They are just what we would be in their situation. If slavery did not exist among them they would not introduce it. If it did now exist among us, we should not instantly give it up. This I believe of the masses North and South. Doubtless there are individuals on both sides who would not hold slaves under any circumstances and others who would gladly introduce slavery anew if it were out of existence. We know that some Southern men do free their slaves, go North, and become tip-top Abolitionists; while some Northern men go South and become most cruel slave masters. When Southern people tell us they are no more responsible for the origin of slavery than we, I acknowledge the fact.

When it is said that the institution exists, and that it is very difficult to get rid of it, in any satisfactory way, I can understand and appreciate the saying. I surely will not blame them for not doing what I should not know how to do myself. If all earthly power were given me, I should not know what to do as to the existing institution. My first impulse would be to free all the slaves and send them to Liberia, to their own native land. But a moment's reflection would convince me that whatever of high hope (as I think there is) there may be in this in the long run, its sudden execution is impossible. If they were all landed there in a day they would all perish in the next ten days; and there are not surplus shipping and surplus money enough in the world to carry them there in many times ten days. What then? Free them all and keep them among us as underlings?

Is it quite certain that this betters their condition? I think I would not hold one in slavery at any rate. Yet the point is not clear enough to me to denounce people upon. What next? Free them and make them politically and socially our equals? My own feelings will not admit of this; and if mine would, we well know that those of the great mass of white people will not. Whether this feeling accords with justice and sound judgment is not the sole question, if, indeed, it is any part of it. A universal feeling, whether well or ill founded, can not be safely disregarded. We can not, then, make them equals. It does seem to me that systems of gradual emancipation might be adopted; but for their tardiness in this I will not undertake to judge our brethren of the South.

While I was at the hotel to-day an elderly gentleman called upon me to know whether I was really in favor of producing a perfect equality between the negroes and white people. While I had not proposed to myself on this occasion to say much on that subject, yet as the question was asked me, I thought I would occupy perhaps five minutes in saying something in regard to it. I will say, then, that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races; that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they can not so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race.

I want, furthermore, to call your attention to this important fact: That after four years of war had embittered men's feelings, after four years of war had got men on both sides at the blood-boiling point, where they sought more to destroy and punish than they sought conclusions of calm reason, Abraham Lincoln, up to a week before the time he was assassinated, had gone no further

than the Mississippi constitution goes to-day. He said, in a letter to Judge Hunt, of Louisiana:

Can it not be possible that you can make some provision for even admitting to suffrage such of these people as are amongst their best educated men and most intelligent classes?

I quote from memory. But this is not all, Mr. Chairman. Some of you remember the late Senator Fessenden, of Maine, who, when discussing the Chinese-exclusion bill in the Senate, said this:

I by no means assent to the doctrine that the negroes are required by the Constitution of the United States to be placed on an equal footing in the States with white citizens.

GREAT REPUBLICAN LEADERS DECLARE THEIR CONVICTIONS.

Preston King, a Republican Senator from New York, a man of great ability, thought the provision in the Oregon constitution against permitting free negroes to settle in the State was harsh, but declared:

I certainly would not be in favor of encouraging the immigration of any considerable number of black men to settle and live among a white population. I think it is the interest of both races that they should live apart.

He favored, so Senator George, of Mississippi, said, the settlement of the free blacks in Central and South America, and he was, he said, perfectly willing that the people of the new free States should exercise their discretion, and exclude negroes if they saw proper.

Remember, Senator King was not discussing whether he would be willing to give negroes suffrage in New York, but whether they ought to be permitted to immigrate thither.

So do I, wherever it is possible, favor keeping them apart, but wherever it is no longer possible for them to live apart—if condemned by historical consequence to live together—I think they should live together upon a working plan whereby civilization itself shall be saved. I think it is brave and noble to meet with a bold and honest front the race problems with which we are confronted. I think it is absolutely foolish to go, like knights-errant, into places all around the world hunting up race problems for the pure fun of solving them.

While I would like to keep the Chinaman and other inferior races away from the white man's country for the purpose of securing as much homogeneity of race, and therefore of aspiration, social and political experience, and tradition as possible, I would also, if I had my way, keep the white man away from the black man's, and the yellow man's, and the brown man's country, and I would not have him superimpose himself upon them. So much for Fessenden and King. Now, I will ask you to listen to this from Judge Edmunds, of Vermont. He says:

This feeling against the Chinaman and this race feeling generally is based upon the belief that nations and races as they have been constituted by the God of nature—

Thank heaven for the word! God made these races, gentlemen. "He fixed their boundaries." Why, I frequently hear people talking on this line, say: "Why should either rule the other? Why should they not live together in perfect fraternity and perfect peace, governing together a common country?" Simply because "God made them." And until God changes them, with their instincts, with their prejudices, their evolution, their aspirations, with their separate characters—theirself, indeed—they are for all purposes of government like water and oil; they will not mix one with the other; one or the other must float; you may have your choice as to which one of the two shall float, but no other choice under God do you have. But to read on further from Senator Edmunds:

This feeling against the Chinaman and this race feeling generally is based upon the belief that nations and races, as they have been constituted by the God of nature and by political and geographical divisions and arrangements, get on better as separate families with their separate independence and their separate institutions than they do amalgamated together, unless their origin, their race, their tendency, their nature is such that being put together they can assimilate and become one perfect, homogeneous, and prosperous mass.

I do not need to call the attention of Senators to that fundamental principle of domestic government, that in order to success—that just success which produces happiness to its people—no republic can succeed that is not a homogeneous population.

All this, Mr. President, is fundamental in the long reaches of historic observation everywhere.

My learned friends from Massachusetts may begin with Aristotle and come down to Webster, and they will find everywhere over that long reach of human experience that the fundamental idea of a prosperous republic must be the homogeneity of its people.

Ah! "those long reaches of historical observation everywhere!" They are the only unailing sources of wisdom.

Now, if the House will indulge me for a moment, I intend to read something else. I intend to read something which, I will say, was intended by me as a grand hailing sign of the white people of the South to their brethren upon this continent and especially upon the Pacific slope. My friends upon the Pacific slope, you have never asked us for bread when dealing with your race problem, which is absolutely insignificant in comparison with ours, without getting what you wanted.

Time and time again we have plead with you for bread and you have given us a stone, and not because you believe any more than

I believe that there is any inborn, inherent, and natural equality among all "featherless bipeds" on the surface of this globe, but for other reasons which I do not intend to go into now. God knows this question is not a question for harsh language nor for crimination nor for recrimination. Moreover, it is not a question of boasting because of what we have done to save ourselves. We have done the best we could do. We propose to do the best we hereafter can do.

Some of our methods have perhaps been crude and some of them perhaps wrong, but we have at any rate done one thing; we have come out after a long and unsuccessful war, and then after a longer and still more unsuccessful and humiliating reconstruction period, with the white ribbon, as the symbol of the white man's civilization, still fluttering upon the tips of our lances, and with God's blessing we will try to make it float forever there. Soon after I came to the Congress of the United States, in talking upon a Chinese-exclusion bill, I used the language which I said I would quote, some of which I will read. I said:

I have found that human nature, all over the world, from the mouth of the Mississippi to the mouth of the Danube, is just about the same thing, within the same broad racial limits. Within the great limits which God has fixed (and it happens accidentally that that is Senator Edmunds's language too), guarded by certain instincts, impulses, tendencies, traditions—within those lines—human nature is the same everywhere. I am willing to trust the motives, the manhood, the generosity, the capacity for self-government, and the capacity for governing, if need be, inferior races, inherent in the white people of the Pacific slope, just as I have appealed to them and as those who have stood here before me have appealed to them and others to trust the capacity for self-government of the people of the South.

I added the following:

I shall support this bill, believing as I do that the white race in the West, as at the South, standing upon the higher round of the ladder of civilization, is willing to put its hands down to the inferior race standing upon the lower level and bring that race up, not to the same level, because, God willing, as the inferior race comes up to our old position, we shall go up by our own development to a new one, bringing the inferior up behind us as we go. But if in response to our invitation to come up higher he shall say to us, "Come thou down lower to me," we answer him in the language of Tennyson, indignant and astonished—

"What! I to herd with narrow foreheads,  
Vacant of our glorious gains?"

I tell you it is not only the highest law, but it is the highest duty, of every life to secure self-preservation and self-perpetuation. I care not whether the life be the life of an individual, a family, a race, a nation, or of a civilization. God has given to everything worthy of life in this world the instinct and has made it a duty to resist attacks from whatsoever quarter, and although your problem out on the Pacific coast is not as serious a one as that with which we are struggling in the South, it may in time become so.

There will come a time, if the influx of Chinamen goes on upon the Pacific slope, when the demagogue will, in order to bolster up party purposes, demand that the Mongolian be equipped with the suffrage "in order that he may defend himself."

I do not remember a single effort of any great man that is so indelibly impressed upon my mind as that of Thomas Jefferson, made early in the history of this country, when he tried to prevail upon our forefathers in Virginia, not only to stop the importation of negroes, but to emancipate and deport them. He failed. He acknowledged that the failure of the effort was because the people were not prepared for it. He went further and said that they would be less and less prepared for it as the numbers of the race increased and antagonisms grew, "yet the day is not distant," he said, "when they must bear and adopt it or worse will follow." Then he added, "For there is nothing more certainly written in the Book of Fate than these two things—first, that these people are to be free, and, secondly, that no two unequal races can long live on the same soil equally free."

And I have frequently thought that there were few men who ever existed, not only in this country, but anywhere else, who equaled Thomas Jefferson in his magnificent foresight. On the occasion referred to I said further:

Had there been prescience enough—that sort of prescience with which intellect is endowed by unselfish love of country—to have followed this greatest of Americans in his leadership then, we would have been rid of a constant threat to our civilization and to our race.

We would not have been standing as we are now upon the very verge of a volcano, ready at almost any time to break forth. We may possess little of the sympathy of some of you gentlemen whom I am trying to help to-day; we may at times possess but little hope except the assurance given us by the fact that we have hitherto proven equal to every emergency, and shall, in the providence of God, prove equal to every emergency in the future; still we trust that we may always conjoin law and order with liberty; that we may, while preserving our own civilization, have the manhood to be just to those to whom we must be schoolmasters.

I am willing, then, Mr. Speaker, as long as the men of the Pacific slope do not ask anything inhuman, do not ask of me anything cruel or anything unkind or immoral, to leave the settlement of this question entirely to them. And I am glad to see that early in the history of this Chinese problem they have been wiser than we were in the early history of the negro problem in the South, when the small number of Africans on this continent constituted a condition other than that with which we are now confronted, and that they are willing to take the question up frankly and deal with it boldly and resolutely.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another thing to which I wish to call your attention. "An ounce of prevention is better worth than a pound of cure;" and the right of self-preservation carries along with it, for the nation, or the race, or the civilization, just as the right of self-defense for the individual

does, the right to anticipate deadly attack. So that all these arguments of gentlemen on the floor that there are only 106,000 or 160,000 Chinese in this country do not appeal to my mind at all. When I see a gentleman over there rising in his place, with anger in his eyes, throwing his hand behind him, and I know he is armed, and I know that there is about him the deadly weapon from whose throat may soon come a deadly missile for me, I have a right to anticipate the deadly attack; and, sir, on the same principle nations have the right, and races above all others have the right, to anticipate.

And I tell you, my friends, that no feelings of philanthropy or of justice have ever called on a race which had through the centuries accumulated the fruits of civilization to surrender any part of that accumulation. No race which through heredity and evolution of capacities has received a training sufficient to make of its members men worthy to command almost every emergency has ever been justly called on to surrender one single bit of the fruits which have come to it through the centuries in that way.

"For I doubt not through the ages one increasing purpose runs,  
And the thoughts of men are widen'd with the process of the suns."

The idea of Tennyson in that couplet is that through the fruits of labor and progress races and nations, like individuals, grow to become wiser and more capable of governing themselves, and the "God in History" uses, as an instrument through which to govern the world, the developed common sense and common conscience of the people.

And so the world goes on and attains true democracy in the course of time, but not immediately. It does not come all at once. It must come gradually through processes of evolution, through the ages and through the centuries. For a race which has through this process of evolution equipped itself for mastery, as well as self-government, tamely to sit down and permit itself to be inundated by Mongolians, or by any other inferior race, not thus equipped and trained, is, in my opinion, not only self-stultification but race suicide; and I, for one, shall not stand here to prevent the people of the Pacific coast from taking, with reference to this matter, a proper course which their own judgment inspires to bring about a solution of the troubles which surround them and to work out their own safety. I shall not do it unless at some time they shall demand something of me which I, in my turn, would not ask of them—something inhuman, something cruel, something wrong.

I tell you, my friends on the Pacific slope, we alone can understand you; we alone on this American continent can understand you; and you, I hope, some day, will try to understand us better; and I think we can not cultivate the acquaintance and knowledge of one another any better than by uniting frankly and fearlessly whenever these questions are presented to do the right thing, trusting our white brethren elsewhere also to do the right, until we have proof positive that they are doing wrong or until they demand something of us that is palpably wrong.

Now, my friends, I have the utmost confidence in this: I have indeed no doubt, that the white race on the Pacific coast will remember two things which William Shakespeare has said, which I am sure that we of the South will also keep in mind. One is that—

\*\*\* it is excellent  
To have a giant's strength; but it is tyrannous  
To use it like a giant.

And the second is as true of a race as it is of an individual:

\*\*\* to thine own self be true,  
And it must follow, as the night the day,  
Thou canst not then be false to any man.

I say that is true of a race. The race that is true to its better instincts, to its own self-preservation, to the perpetuation of its own civilization and its higher ideals, although somebody may resent the mastership which it takes of others for the time being, can not be false to any race, but must necessarily, as a part of its own advancing civilization, drag the other, no less volens, along with it to a higher state than it now occupies.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I wish to say that I shall vote for the amendments offered to the bill by these gentlemen who understand the problem with which they are confronted, who understand the race that has given them this trouble; because I believe that the Chinese race, as far as I have seen it, is but little superior to the race which I know so well, and which has given us so much trouble, with the aid and assistance very frequently of gentlemen on the other side of this House.

When a race has not been developed up to the point where it has a trained common sense and common conscience, right governmental aspirations, and right purposes—the true self-governing instinct—all law, all statute books, all mere abstractions sink like waste paper to the bottom, saturated in the water, and vanish without anything being left.

I once said upon the floor of this House, and I repeat it now, that Mississippi has not, because she could not, of course, put into her constitution one word that is at variance with the fifteenth or the fourteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States. In the opinion of Mississippians, in the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the opinion of Judge Cooley, she has not done this. I do not deny that the only reason why she did not do it was because it would have been unconstitutional. Whenever you want to be honest and right about this matter of cutting off our representation, leave us free, then, of the

shackles of the amendments, both the fourteenth and fifteenth. We will meet you there; but as long as they are in the Constitution we are going to try to obey them.

We have disqualified illiteracy. But in that connection I want to say this—that there is a difference between ignorance and illiteracy. We have disqualified illiteracy, but sometimes an illiterate man is tolerably well educated and sometimes a literate man is very ignorant. If you take 10,000 Scotch, English, Welsh, or Americans who can not read a letter in a book and shipwreck them to-morrow upon some island where they can find physical sustenance and support, you would find in a year or so when you went back there that they had a government—crude and imperfect, perhaps, but protecting property, conserving and safeguarding the virtue of females, defending the sanctity of home life; and you could take 10,000 Indians educated at Carlisle or at Hampton and shipwreck them in the same place and go back there in two or three years and they would have their old tribal relations.

You may take 10,000 negroes, graduates of Harvard College, if you could find them, and leave them by themselves without white guidance and without touch of the white man's current of thought and civilization. Go back in a generation and half of the men would be killed and the other half would have at least two wives each and have something very near to tribal relations themselves. But Mississippi could validly and constitutionally not make race distinctions, and she did not. She was sorry to disfranchise some good white men capable of self-government, but she had to do it to be fair with the Constitution.

The only way in which the white people of the South can be made to fail to be true to themselves and just to their inferiors would be to stir up once more, if you will, the smoldering fires of race hatred, which had died out because of lack of provocation developed under political excitement of campaigns occurring annually, biennially, and quadrennially. Then in moments of great provocation, in moments of great excitement, they might perhaps forget that, while they had "a giant's strength," they ought not "to use it as giants." But if you will let us alone—let us work out our own problems—we will try to solve them upon the theories which I have indicated.

Now, a few words just from a legal standpoint, and I shall have done with this discussion. The ostensible object of these resolutions, which go by the name of my friend from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER], is to investigate certain "legal conditions." Will any man in the world tell me that that is the only object of these resolutions? Why, if that were so the constitutions and the books of laws would explain that for themselves. Is it this—to investigate the methods of carrying on the elections in the South, to see if there is intimidation and fraud? If that is the intention, then let them investigate election methods and corruptions all over the country. If it is to investigate the legal question alone, there are the books and you can investigate them.

Now, so far as Mississippi is concerned, she disfranchises nobody except for crime, which is permitted by the fourteenth amendment, and on an educational condition, which Judge Cooley says is not an "abridgment or denial of suffrage," because it is not cutting off entirely suffrage, but merely submitting the voter to conditions precedent, which he can comply with if he will take the trouble to learn how to read. And then again on the tax qualification.

The poll taxes and all other taxes must be paid. The rich man, who is generally white, has to pay taxes on every dollar he owns plus a poll tax, while the poor man has to pay the poll tax only and is not required with us, by any power of legal enforcement, to pay that sum, unless he wants to vote. Judge Cooley says that that is not an abridgment of the suffrage because it merely requires a condition precedent to be complied with which each man of ordinary thrift and worth could comply with and which is for the betterment of society. I am not quoting the language exactly, but will do so. It is from Judge Cooley on the Principles of Constitutional Law, which is an elementary book, comprehensible by everybody, and which I will insert at this place:

The second clause of the fourteenth article was intended to influence the States to bring about by their voluntary action the same result that is now accomplished by this amendment. It provided that when the right to vote was denied to any of the male inhabitants of a State, being 21 years of age and citizens of the United States, or any way abridged except for participation in crime, the basis of representation in Congress should be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens should bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State. By this the purpose was to induce the States to admit colored freemen to the privilege of suffrage by reducing the representation and influence of the States in the Federal Government in case they refused.

No opportunity occurred for testing the efficacy of this plan previous to the adoption of the fifteenth article, and it can not therefore be affirmed whether it would or would not have been successful. Important questions, however, may still arise under it. The provision is general; it is not limited to freedmen, but it applies to wherever the right to vote is denied to make citizens of the proper age, or is abridged for other causes than for participation in crime. The State of Connecticut denies the right of suffrage to all who can not read, and Massachusetts and Missouri to all who can not both read and write, and many of the States admit no one to the privilege of suffrage unless he is a taxpayer.

So in the majority of the States a citizen absent therefrom, though in the public service, can not vote, because the State requires as a condition the personal presence of the voter at the polls of his municipality. Possibly it may be said in respect to such cases that the representation of the State should be reduced in proportion to the number of those who are excluded because they can not read or write or do not pay taxes or are absent. It is not likely, however, that any such position would be sustained. To require the payment of a capitation tax is no denial of suffrage; it is demanding only the preliminary performance of public duty, and may be classed, as may also presence at the polls, with registration or the observance of any other preliminary to insure fairness and protect against fraud.

Nor can it be said to require ability to read is any denial of suffrage. To refuse to receive one's vote because he was born in some particular country rather than elsewhere, or because of his color, or because of any natural quality or peculiarity which it would be impossible for him to overcome, is plainly a denial of suffrage. But ability to read is something within the power of any man. It is not difficult to attain it, and it is no hardship to require it. On the contrary, the requirement only by indirection compels one to appropriate a personal benefit he might otherwise neglect. It denies to no man the suffrage, but the privilege is freely tendered to all, subject only to a condition that is beneficial in its performance, and light in its burden. If a property qualification, or the payment of taxes upon property when one has none to be taxed, is made a condition to suffrage, there may be room for more question.

A clause in the Mississippi constitution requires that the voter shall be able to read and write before he shall have the privilege of suffrage, and we have a clause that is called the "understanding clause." The general impression seems to be that we do not allow a man to vote in Mississippi unless he goes to a registrar and the registrar sees if he can understand the constitution. This is an error, like that other impression that there is no appeal from the decision of the registrar. Any man who can read can vote in Mississippi, and we ascertain that fact just as it is ascertained elsewhere where the qualification exists. Why, any man that can read is not required by our constitution to understand anything, upon the schoolmaster's theory that the man who reads is necessarily not ignorant. Sometimes he is very ignorant, while on the other hand sometimes an illiterate man is very knowing. That is, the so-called "understanding clause" is an extension of the franchise, not an abridgment.

I want to say right now that there is not a single clause of the Mississippi constitution that operates against the black man that does not operate against the white man subject to the same conditions precedent, whether in theory, in law, upon the statute book, or in principle or practice at the polls. I want to say right now that there are more negroes—black people, colored people—who get admitted to the suffrage in Mississippi upon the "understanding clause" than there are white people; and it grows out of race instinct. The white man who can not read or write feels that it is a humiliation for him to say so, and to ask for an understanding examination. The negro does not feel that humiliation, and goes and asks for it. There are very few who ever vote under it, either black or white; but absolutely more colored people than there are white people vote under that provision.

Now, gentlemen, if, upon the other hand, a demand that the voter shall be registered is an abridgment of the Constitution in Mississippi, it is an abridgment in every other State in the Union which requires previous registration and previous residence in the precinct or in the State or in the county. If an educational qualification is legally an abridgment, it is an abridgment in Connecticut, it is an abridgment in Massachusetts, it is an abridgment in Vermont, and if the understanding qualification mentioned in the law books, so little resorted to in practice, be an abridgment, what must the requirement be in the State of Vermont—the requirement to be "of good moral character?"

Mr. PALMER. Did the gentleman ever hear of anybody denying that proposition?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. What proposition?

Mr. PALMER. That these abridgments are abridgments in every State in the North as well as in the South?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am pretty well convinced that gentlemen in their hearts, some way or other, are expecting to make some sort of a difference, or else this resolution would never have been introduced into the House, and if my friend is candid, so is he, is he not?

Mr. PALMER. No; it covers every State in the Union.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Verbally, yes; intentionally, no. I believe, as surely as I am standing here, that this resolution was introduced to strike at North Carolina, South Carolina, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama, and at them alone.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I understood the gentleman to say that in his judgment the State of Mississippi had not denied or abridged the right of any male inhabitant, 21 years of age, a citizen of the United States, to vote, within the meaning of the Constitution. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I understood the gentleman to say also that the method of the administration of the election laws in the State of Mississippi was altogether fair and impartial.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Undoubtedly; but your resolution does not go to the method at all. Your question is irrelevant. Still I answer in the affirmative.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Then what objection can the gentleman have, speaking from the standpoint of his own State, to any kind of an investigation of this question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Because it inaugurates once more the interference by a partisan legislative body with the suffrage question in the South instead of leaving the question to be determined by the people of the States or by the courts; it will inaugurate once more the going at each session of Congress a step further in centralization and interference with local self-government, and it will inaugurate a partisan majority report, a partisan minority report, and a disturbance of business enterprise and budding progress all over the South.

I will say to my friend that I do not frankly believe, as a Democrat, speaking from a party standpoint, that these resolutions are going to do the Republican party any good, or that they are going to do the Democratic party any harm; but they are going to do the South a great deal of harm. I love the South better than I do the Democratic party, much as I love it and am grateful to it. When the people see the sword of Damocles hanging over them, and what they regard as an effort being made in any part of the Union to disrupt the social and political conditions again by trying to bring them into a position where it may be remotely possible that we may have another carnival of vice, crime, ignorance, and Africanization, it will disturb the business of the South, producing business anarchy and threatening social chaos.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Will the gentleman allow a suggestion?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The gentleman knows that there is quite a general belief throughout the country that some States have denied or abridged the right of citizens of the United States to vote, and that they are enjoying a representation that has no constitutional basis. Now, would it not be worth much to the South and the whole country to have an investigation and to demonstrate to the country the truth of the gentleman's conclusion that these States have not disfranchised citizens and that they are administering the election laws of the State with the utmost fairness?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Surely my friend and I want to be candid and honest on this question. I certainly would not object to any fair and impartial investigation by a nonpolitical authority. But surely the gentleman does not mean to tell me that he considers a committee of the House of Representatives, appointed upon a resolution of this sort, as anything more than a bipartisan committee at best, a tribunal which will bring back two reports—a majority report and a minority report—and both of them framed solidly, every Republican for one and every Democrat for the other, along party lines.

Mr. JACKSON of Kansas. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Let me finish my statement and then I will yield to the gentleman.

Now, if you want to investigate, why not do it properly? The jury system in North Carolina is founded on the grandfather clause. The whole constitution hangs together. Why not make a case and carry it to the Supreme Court and let it decide the question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave for just long enough to answer a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that his time may be extended for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I should like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi a question. He knows, of course, that it is one of the important duties of the House of Representatives to apportion representation. Does he not know that the House must base its action upon its own information, and that it can only acquire information through its own agencies or organs?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. No; I do not know that. First, because Congress has exhausted its power of apportionment until 1910; second, because I think it would be much fairer for the House to base its action on evidence collected and conclusion obtained through the courts or in some other nonpartisan way.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Well, that is a new proposition.

Mr. JACKSON of Kansas. In view of the proposed investigation as to the validity of the election laws of certain States, I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] whether he is willing to consent at the proper time to an amendment that we may investigate as to the validity of the law of any State which in any way prohibits a candidate from accepting a nomination from more than one party?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is a proposition I do not know anything about.

Mr. JACKSON of Kansas. Well, I will take pleasure in giving the gentleman some information on that subject, if he will permit me.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I have not heard any complaint—certainly not in my part of the country—with reference to that matter, and have not heard any restriction proposed upon the action of candidates in that respect.

Mr. JACKSON of Kansas. Well, it is, I may say, with sadness and sorrow that I inform the gentleman that that question has been raised in the great State of Kansas.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I understood that the Democratic candidate for the Presidency in 1896 and in 1900 was nominated by several different political parties. But I have not understood that any constitutional objection was raised, and as a Federal question it occurs to me it is one with which this body has nothing to do.

Mr. JACKSON of Kansas. I want to inform the gentleman that since that time the Republican party in the State of Kansas has said that it was a crime to accept nominations from several political parties and that it should not be repeated.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Let me ask the gentleman whether he does not believe that that particular question is a local one—local to the State of Kansas?

Mr. JACKSON of Kansas. No more local to the State of Kansas than the other question to Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, or any other Southern State whose election provisions you propose to investigate.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I would ask whether that—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I shall be glad to discuss the question with the gentleman some other time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I ask consent to insert in the RECORD the language of Cooley's Principles of Constitutional Law, to which I have referred, together with the references given by the author. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANNON. If this concludes the general debate—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I would like an opportunity to speak for about seven minutes in the morning. If I can be recognized now, I will yield the floor for a motion to adjourn.

Mr. CANNON. I think the gentleman from Indiana has ingenuity enough, if anybody should undertake to oppose his request, to get ten minutes to-morrow.

Mr. BENTON. I think we can give him ten minutes.

Mr. CANNON. I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LAWRENCE reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union had had under consideration the sundry civil appropriation bill and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### RECIPROCAL TRADE RELATIONS WITH CUBA.

Mr. PAYNE. By direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I report back, with a recommendation that it pass, the bill (H. R. 12765) to provide for reciprocal trade relations with Cuba.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. PAYNE. I desire to give notice that I shall ask the House to consider this bill on Tuesday of next week—the 8th of April, I believe. I now ask unanimous consent that any member or members of the committee may file his or their dissenting views at any time during the present week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that any member of the Committee on Ways and Means may have leave to file minority views in respect to the bill just reported at any time during the present week? The Chair hears no objection.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 12315. An act granting an increase of pension to James Todd;

H. R. 2273. An act granting a pension to Martha A. De Lamater;

H. R. 10486. An act granting a pension to Alida Payne; and

H. R. 11418. An act granting an increase of pension to Hannah T. Knowles.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama, for two weeks, on account of important business.

To Mr. MORRELL, for four days, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. DE GRAFFENREID, indefinitely, on account of important business.

Mr. CANNON. I move that the House adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed in the court in the case of Dorcas, Elizabeth, and Samuel McCammon, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Director of the Mint submitting an estimate of appropriation for mint at San Francisco—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SOUTHARD, from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12705) to amend section 3536, Revised Statutes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1262); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOMBS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 257) to establish a light-house and fog-signal station at Mukilteo Point, near the city of Everett, State of Washington, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1263); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 258) providing additional funds for the establishment of a light-house and fog-signal station at Browns Point, on Commencement Bay, State of Washington, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1264); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 260) to establish a fog-signal at Battery Point, State of Washington, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1265); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 265) to establish a light-house and fog-signal station on Burrows Island, State of Washington, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1266); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHAFROTH, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12796) providing for free homesteads in the Ute Indian Reservation in Colorado, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1275); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MANN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3513) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River, at or near Parkville, Mo., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1267); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12765) to provide for reciprocal trade relations with Cuba, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1276); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. WEEKS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 957) for the relief of J. J. L. Peel, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a

report (No. 1268); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. THOMAS of Iowa, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2216) for the relief of Elizabeth Muhleman, widow, and the heirs at law of Samuel A. Muhleman, deceased, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1269); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4233) for the relief of David V. Howell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1270); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CURTIS, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12710) for the relief of Elizabeth McKinney, a citizen Pottawatomie Indian, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1271); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STORM, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2393) for the relief of Joseph B. Sargent, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1274); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk, and laid on the table, as follows:

Mr. PARKER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6458) for the relief of Thomas F. Tobey, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1272); which said bill and report were laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8544) to place Elias H. Parsons on the retired list of the Army, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1273); which said bill and report were laid on the table.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 13205) to provide for the erection of a monument for Joseph Anthony Mower—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 13206) providing for the appointment of civil engineers in the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SCHIRM (by request): A bill (H. R. 13207) to incorporate the Washington Cooling Company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 13208) to authorize the United States and West Indies Railroad and Steamship Company, of Florida, to construct a bridge across the Manatee River, in the State of Florida—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: A resolution (H. Res. 185) that the Speaker of the House appoint some person specially qualified to have the care and charge of House bathing rooms—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SULZER: A resolution (H. Res. 186) concerning the Boer war going on in South Africa—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Memorial of the legislature of Minnesota, in favor of allowing the State of Minnesota 5 per cent of the proceeds of public lands appropriated for military services to the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the legislature of Minnesota, in favor of Senate bill 3575—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRIS: Memorial by the legislature of Minnesota, relating to Senate bill 3575—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial to Congress by the legislature of Minnesota, respecting the 5 per cent of the minimum price of the public lands that have been appropriated as compensation for military services rendered the United States since the admission of Minnesota into the Union—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 13209) to correct the military record of Henry Fitzgerald—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROMWELL: A bill (H. R. 13210) granting an increase of pension to Gustav Tafel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 13211) granting a pension to Melissa Burton, widow of William Burton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 13212) to correct the military record of Henry N. Penfield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 13213) granting a pension to John A. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13214) granting an increase of pension to William W. Rollins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANBURY: A bill (H. R. 13215) to correct the military record of Bernard Corrigan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13216) to correct the military record of Simon W. Larkin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JETT: A bill (H. R. 13217) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Dodge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13218) granting an increase of pension to Henry L. Karns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13219) granting a pension to Alcinda Notestine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOY: A bill (H. R. 13220) granting an increase of pension to William Sendelbach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 13221) granting a pension to Benjamin W. Keith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 13222) for the relief of Charles Candy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13223) for the relief of Mary E. O. Dashiell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13224) granting an increase of pension to John Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEVIN: A bill (H. R. 13225) granting an increase of pension to George Hallick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13226) granting a pension to William Warner—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 13227) granting a pension to Elizabeth J. Emry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13228) granting an increase of pension to George Russell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 13229) granting a pension to Rensalaer W. Zindle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 13230) granting an increase of pension to Luther Towne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13231) for the relief of the estate of Preston Bond—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 13232) granting an increase of pension to Alanson A. Austin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 13233) granting a pension to William A. Nelson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 13234) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Johnson, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 13235) granting an increase of pension to Anna Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZENOR: A bill (H. R. 13236) granting a pension to James Long—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 13237) granting an increase of pension to John V. Sanders—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13238) granting an increase of pension to Carlos M. Niles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13239) granting an increase of pension to Ervin Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13240) granting an increase of pension to Nimrod F. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13241) for the relief of John S. Friend, of Eldorado, State of Kansas—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: A bill (H. R. 13242) granting a pension to Melissa and Lavinia Pendock—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 13243) granting a pension to Leah Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: Petition of George E. Hedges and other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., for the passage of a bill to prevent the desecration of the national flag—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Protest of the Merchants' Exchange, Buffalo, N. Y., against the passage of Senate bill 1118—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALL of Delaware: Petition of citizens of Kent County, Del., favoring the passage of Senate bill 1891, for a further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Operative Plasterers' International Association No. 38; of Wilmington Typographical Union, No. 123; of Amalgamated Wood Workers' Union No. 108, and of Wilmington Lodge, No. 184, International Association of Machinists, of Wilmington, Del., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BROMWELL: Papers to accompany House bill 13210, granting an increase of pension to Gustav Tafel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 10403, granting a pension to Emma Plumb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: Resolutions of the Wisconsin Game Protective Association, urging the passage of the Lacey bills, H. R. 10306 and H. R. 11535, with reference to the preservation of game—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BULL: Resolutions of Granite Cutters' Union No. 2, of Newport, R. I., favoring the construction of war vessels in the United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Amasa M. Eaton and other citizens of Providence, R. I., for the collection of statistics relating to marriage and divorce—to the Select Committee on the Census.

Also, resolutions of Iron Molders' Union No. 41, of Providence, R. I., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DOUGHERTY: Resolution of Stanberry Lodge, Locomotive Firemen, Stanberry, Mo., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of the same lodge, favoring extension of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOVENER: Resolutions of Bricklayers' Union No. 1, of Wheeling, W. Va., favoring a reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Stone Cutters' Association, Flint Glass Workers' Union No. 59, Potters' Union No. 28, and Potters' Union No. 6, all of Wheeling, W. Va.; Stone Cutters' Association of New Martinsville, and Potters' Union of New Cumberland, W. Va., favoring educational test in the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: Petition of Pee Division, No. 265, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Florence, S. C., favoring the passage of the Hoar-Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolution of Wisconsin Game Protective Association, Milwaukee, Wis., in favor of the enactment of the Lacey bill for the protection of game animals—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Resolutions of Captain Charles W. Chapman Circle, No. 60, Ladies of Grand Army of the Republic, of Allegheny, Pa., favoring a bill providing pensions to certain officers and men in the Army and Navy of the United States when 50 years of age and over, and increasing widows' pensions to \$12 per month—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the National Hay Association, Winchester, Ind., favoring House bill 8337 and Senate bill 3575, amending the interstate-commerce act—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Resolutions of Division No. 73, Order of Railway Conductors, Ashtabula, Ohio, and Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers No. 368, Atlanta, Ga., favoring the passage of the Hoar-Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASKINS: Petition of Martha Washington Council, No. 3, Daughters of Liberty, East Burke, Vt., favoring restricted immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HITT: Resolutions of Atlantic Coast Seamen's Union in regard to employment of Chinese stokers on Pacific vessels—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL: Resolutions of Trenton Division, Order of Railway Telegraphers, Trenton, N. J., favoring the passage of the Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LACEY: Resolution of Wisconsin Game Protective Association, favoring the passage of House bill No. 10306, for the preservation of wild animals and game birds—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, resolutions of Union No. 162, of Ottumwa, Iowa, favoring the passage of the Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Resolutions of Building Trades Council, of

Yonkers, N. Y., for increase of pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of Signal Mount Lodge, No. 372, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, favoring restrictive immigration laws—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of the same lodge, in favor of the exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MANN: Resolutions of Maine Lodge, No. 545, of East St. Louis, Ill.; Beauoup Lodge, No. 549, of Carbondale, Ill., and J. L. Burlingame Lodge, No. 320, of Flora, Ill., favoring the passage of the Foraker-Corliss safety-appliance bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts: Petition of J. Riley Rogers and other residents of Byfield, Mass., in favor of the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MORRIS: Petition of Plumbers' Union No. 11, of Duluth, Minn., for the exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Stone Cutters' Association and Carpenters' Union of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the construction of naval vessels at Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NAPHEN: Petition of the Iroquois Club, of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the construction of war vessels in the United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Resolutions of Patriotic Branch, No. 391, Polish National Society, of Lykens, Pa., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolutions of Seneca G. Simmons Circle, No. 17, Ladies of Grand Army of the Republic, Harrisburg, Pa., favoring a bill providing pensions to certain officers and men in the Army and Navy of the United States when 50 years of age and over, and increasing widows' pensions to \$12 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Typographical Union No. 14, of Harrisburg, Pa., in favor of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Harrisburg Lodge, No. 383, and Herculean Lodge, No. 574, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and Union No. 278, of Lebanon, Pa., and petition of 51 citizens of Shiremans-town, Pa., favoring more rigid restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OTJEN: Resolutions of Wisconsin Game Protective Association, favoring the passage of House bill 10306, for the preservation of wild animals and game birds—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. PARKER: Resolutions of Essex Lodge, No. 72, Railroad Trainmen, and Iron Molders' Union No. 91, of Newark, N. J., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Steam Fitters' Union No. 40, of Newark, N. J., for the passage of House bill 9330, for a further restriction of Chinese immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBB: Paper in support of House bill 12644, authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish an artificial leg to Allen P. Dace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS: Sundry petitions of and letters from citizens of Massachusetts, favoring the construction of war vessels at the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RUCKER: Protest of merchants of Jacksonville, Mo., against House bill 6578, known as the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RYAN: Petitions of branches Nos. 164, 380, and Synowie Wolnosci, Polish societies of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 16—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolutions of Building Trades Council of Yonkers, N. Y., indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: Resolutions of Beet Sugar Factory Company, of Fort Collins, Colo., in opposition to reductions in the tariff on raw sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SKILES: Resolutions of Bricklayers and Masons' Union No. 29, Lorain, Ohio, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of C. P. Ogden Post, No. 569, Nova, Ohio, favoring the building of war ships in the navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Bricklayers and Masons' Union No. 29, Lorain, Ohio, and Deer Lick Division, No. 292, Railway Conductors, Chicago, Ill., favoring a further restriction of Chinese immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolution of Polish Society of Wallingford, Conn., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-

General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Resolutions of Park Lodge, No. 555, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and Detroit River Lodge, No. 2, of Detroit, Mich., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Polish Society No. 53, of Detroit, Mich., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolutions of Charles T. Foster Post, No. 42, of Lansing, Mich., regarding employees at the United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: Papers to accompany House bill 13230, granting a pension to Luther Town—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STARK: Petition of Thomas H. Dry and 22 other citizens of Diller, Nebr., favoring an amendment to the Constitution making polygamy a crime—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of M. W. Dinneen and 88 other citizens of Fillmore County, Nebr., asking that the United States tender its good offices for intervention between the Boer Republic and Great Britain to the end that hostilities may cease—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of the National Association of Clothiers, of New York, indorsing the Ray bankruptcy bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Building Trades Council of New York, favoring increase of compensation to letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: Resolution of Esther Lodge, No. 352, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Estherville, Iowa, favoring the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Paper to accompany House bill, granting a pension to Nancy V. J. Ferrell, Elizabethtown, Ill.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS: Petitions of officers of the California National Guard, favoring House bill 11654, increasing the efficiency of the militia—to the Committee on Militia.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, April 1, 1902.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings; when, on request of Mr. HALE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved, if there be no objection.

### PERSONS IN CLASSIFIED SERVICE FROM SOUTH CAROLINA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Civil Service Commissioners, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 24th ultimo, a list of persons now holding places in the classified service charged to the State of South Carolina, their names, present addresses, etc.; which, with the accompanying paper, was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (H. R. 2273) granting a pension to Martha A. De Lamater;  
A bill (H. R. 10486) granting a pension to Alida Payne;  
A bill (H. R. 11418) granting an increase of pension to Hannah T. Knowles; and  
A bill (H. R. 12315) granting an increase of pension to James Todd.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented petitions of sundry citizens of Eden, Wayne, and Akron, all in the State of New York, praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Building Trades Council, American Federation of Labor, of Yonkers, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the salary of letter carriers; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Manufacturers' Association of New York City and Brooklyn, N. Y., and a petition of the Granite Cutters' Local Union, American Federation of Labor, of Putnam County, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of